

never came before the Committee on Rules and Administration. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; but I may say—

Mr. WHERRY. Just a moment. The only reason I am interested in it is I do not like a precedent to be established by providing salaries which are out of line with the recommendation of the Committee on Rules and Administration. So I ask the Senator this question: Has the distinguished Senator taken it up with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I have discussed it with the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it correct to say that the joint resolution did not go to the Committee on Rules and Administration?

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator tell me once again what the top salary is which is proposed to be paid to counsel under the joint resolution?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The resolution authorizes the committee to pay counsel up to \$17,500. That is to say, it is not to exceed that amount. Of course, that does not mean that counsel will be paid that sum. The Senator should consider that if we are to get a top-flight man, he will have to give up what he is doing and of course abandon his law practice for a short time. He would be paid at that rate. Also, perhaps he may not live in Washington and it would be necessary under those circumstances for him to sustain himself here.

Mr. WHERRY. The majority leader served for a long time on the committee which handled the contingent expenses of the Senate. I shall not raise a question about this matter, because if it was unanimously agreed to, and the joint resolution is passed, it is agreeable to me. However, I am pointing out that the resolution did not go before the Committee on Rules and Administration, and there is no breakdown for the budget. I, too, wish the committee to have the kind of counsel they need. I want them to have able counsel. However, I desire to point out that because this resolution is brought up late at night and has not gone through the Committee on Rules and Administration, we may be establishing a practice which is different from the usual practice pertaining to salaries ordinarily paid, a question on which the Committee on Rules and Administration has acted, at least during this Congress and I think during other Congresses as well. I am not objecting, but I should like the Record to show that even though this action is taken by unanimous consent it does not establish a precedent, in view of the fact that the resolution never went to the Committee on Rules and Administration for consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. This resolution would not go to that committee. This is a joint resolution, which must go to the House, must be acted upon by the House, and must be approved by the President, because it changes the law with reference to compensation.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree entirely with the statement of the Chair, but I submit, as the President of the Senate well knows, that there are certain provisions

and rules of the Senate which provide that a breakdown shall be submitted with a resolution, the purpose of it being to have a review of it by the Committee on Rules and Administration. This was not done in the case of the substitute resolution agreed to earlier today, but it was done in the case of the original resolution, as I understand.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That applies to a Senate resolution, not to a joint resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, May 4, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 3 (legislative day of March 29), 1950:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Thomas H. Lockett, of Kentucky, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

Carl Breuer, of New York, now a Foreign Service officer of class 4 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Kenneth C. Beede, of Massachusetts.
Charles C. Sundell, of Minnesota.

The following-named Foreign Service reserve officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Frederick L. Jochem, of Wisconsin.
George H. Reese, of Virginia.

The following-named Foreign Service reserve officers to be vice consuls of the United States of America:

Mrs. Frances H. Baker, of Alabama.
Phillip I. La Sage, of Wisconsin.
Mrs. Margaret R. Parkin, of Ohio.

Lloyd A. Free, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service reserve officer, to be a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

IN THE NAVY

Midshipman James P. Rasmussen, Jr. (Naval Academy), to be an ensign in the Navy, from the 2d day of June 1950.

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be ensigns in the Navy, from the 2d day of June 1950:

Emil R. Borgers	Alexander M. McDougal
Wenzell B. Bryant	Richard M. Regan
John P. Donovan	Charles L. Sweeney, Jr.
William F. Gerold	John H. Thorp
Ralph H. Henty, Jr.	Albert R. Knotts, Jr.
Rothschild H. Holden	

Richard G. Williams (Naval ROTC) to be an ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy, from the 2d day of June 1950.

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, from the 2d day of June 1950:

James A. Derrick	John P. Plunkett
Johan S. Gestson	Henry F. Schlueter
Kenneth C. Johnson	Roderick M. Stewart
Theodore H. Kruse	Taylor J. Tucker
Robert D. Morse	Anthony H. Winchell
Richard E. Packard	

Norman F. Lattin (Naval ROTC) to be an ensign in the Navy, from the 2d day of June 1950, in lieu of ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps, as previously nominated.

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, from the 2d day of June 1950, in lieu of ensigns in the Navy, as previously nominated:

Phillip B. Ezell	Albert E. Shaw, Jr.
Richard D. Flynn	Paul J. Uhlig
Helge R. Hukari	

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

Homer S. Arnold	William F. Hughes
Edward W. Bird	Roger G. Ireland
Louis F. Brignac, Jr.	Melvin A. Kutschbach
Robert J. Cales	John W. McAllister
Charles M. Callis	James L. May
Halvard J. Davidson	William R. Moore
Thomas F. Dillon	Benjamin P. Owens
Malcolm D. Dinges, Jr.	Earl Peterson
Owen W. Doyle	David L. Spence
Frank L. Golbranson	Richard C. Stevens
John H. Griffin	Francis J. Sweeney
David H. Hosp	Winston F. Whipple
James R. Householder	McClure Wilson

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

Robert W. Elliott, Jr.
William A. Ruel
Chester H. Tiberil

Henry B. Wilson (civilian college graduate) to be an ensign in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy.

Joan Rhodarmar to be an ensign in the Nurse Corps of the Navy.

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Lewis D. Williams

LIEUTENANT

Sidney H. Cohen

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Loy T. Brown
Francis L. Giknis
Charles H. Howarth

The following-named officer (woman) to the grade indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Norman C. Furtos

The following-named officer to the grade indicated in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Marjorie C. Chilcott

The following-named officer for temporary appointment to the grade of corps indicated:

COMMANDER, MEDICAL CORPS

Harry L. Day

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 3, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, in and by whom we live and move and have our being, there is no one unto whom we may draw nigh with such confidence.

There is no one who understands our needs so perfectly; no one unto whom we may unburden our hearts so completely; no one of whom we may ask so much; no one so willing to grant our requests

and give us strength and victory in every struggle for truth and righteousness.

Help us to believe and know and feel that Thou art seeking to be our counselor and guide in all that we think and say and do. We humbly confess that we are often so self-willed and so unlike Thee in thought and word and deed.

We pray that our plans and purposes during this day may be a clear and glorious testimony that we are striving to mediate to all mankind the blessings of freedom and peace.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

Mr. JACKSON of California (interrupting the reading of the Journal). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the Journal be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not like to begin entertaining that request unless the Journal be very long; its reading will take but a moment.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On April 27, 1950:

H. R. 3462. An act for the relief of Walter J. O'Toole;

H. R. 3769. An act for the relief of Doris M. Faulkner;

H. R. 3924. An act for the relief of Dr. T. F. Harrison;

H. R. 4502. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to dispose of a certain easement near Fort Belvoir, Va., in exchange for another easement elsewhere on the same property;

H. R. 5704. An act for the relief of Janis Shimada; and

H. R. 6093. An act for the relief of Masami Hiroya and Alko Hiroya.

On April 28, 1950:

H. R. 33. An act to authorize Joe Graham Post, No. 119, American Legion, upon certain conditions, to lease the lands conveyed to it by the act of June 15, 1933;

H. R. 1726. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the city of Hot Springs, Ark., a perpetual easement for the construction and operation of a water-main pipe line;

H. R. 2554. An act to amend the District of Columbia Credit Unions Act of 1932;

H. R. 3010. An act for the relief of Walter E. Parks;

H. R. 3138. An act for the relief of Arthur Holbert; the estate of Ernest L. Gass, deceased; and the estate of James L. Thomas, deceased;

H. R. 4070. An act to cancel drainage charges against certain lands within the Uintah Indian irrigation project, Utah;

H. R. 4316. An act to repeal the authority to assess certain owners of nonmilitary buildings situated within the limits of the Fort Monroe Military Reservation, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4380. An act for the relief of Mrs. Agnes Emma Hay;

H. R. 5753. An act for the relief of Jean Clark;

H. R. 5921. An act to terminate lump-sum benefits provided by law to certain Reserve officers of the Navy and Air Force;

H. R. 6282. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elvior Anne-Britt Jedlund;

H. R. 6283. An act for the relief of Johnny Nielsen;

H. R. 6345. An act for the relief of Mrs. Raymond Schaffer, Jr.;

H. R. 6475. An act to amend the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948 to provide for the consideration of claims for the payment of certain postal notes filed later than 1 year from the last day of the month of issue;

H. R. 6694. An act for the relief of Ervin Haas and Leno Vescovi; and

H. R. 6695. An act for the relief of Edgar F. Russell, Lillian V. Russell, his wife; and Bessie R. Ward.

On April 29, 1950:

H. R. 715. An act for the relief of Manuel Uribe;

H. R. 1487. An act for the relief of Lt. (sg) Giacomo Falco;

H. R. 1871. An act for the relief of Hilde Flint;

H. R. 2591. An act for the relief of Giovanna Parisi, Michelina Valletta, Yolanda Altieri, Generosa Tamburi, Carolina Picciano, and Giovanna Turtur;

H. R. 3150. An act to revise and repeal certain acts relating to rules of survey to permit departures from the system of rectangular survey when necessary on all public lands, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3482. An act granting the consent of the Congress to the negotiation of a compact relating to the waters of the Canadian River by the States of Oklahoma, Texas, and New Mexico;

H. R. 3771. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marie Gulbenkian;

H. R. 4408. An act to amend the act, approved May 27, 1924, entitled "An act to fix the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, United States Park Police force, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia," so as to grant rights to members of the United States Park Police force commensurate with the rights granted to members of Metropolitan Police force as to time off from duty;

H. R. 4285. An act to amend the act of July 31, 1946, in order retroactively to advance in grade, time in grade, and compensation certain employees in the postal field service who are veterans of World War II;

H. R. 4289. An act to require settlers on public lands in Alaska to record notice of their settlement claims in the land office for the district in which the lands are situated, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4959. An act to reimburse the Fisher Contracting Co.;

H. R. 6003. An act for the relief of Beulah L. White, widow of John E. White;

H. R. 6539. An act to amend Public Law 626, Eightieth Congress, relating to the Army Institute of Pathology Building; and

H. R. 6696. An act for the relief of Lawrence B. Williams and his wife, Viva Craig Williams.

On May 1, 1950:

H. R. 1600. An act for the relief of Gustav Schilbred.

On May 2, 1950:

H. R. 2895. An act to authorize the sale of select base material at the Fort Benning Military Reservation, to Muscogee County, State of Georgia, for use on county roads;

H. R. 6354. An act to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight saving time in the District; and

H. R. 7846. An act to amend title VIII of the National Housing Act, as amended, to encourage construction of rental housing on or in areas adjacent to Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force installations, and for other purposes.

HIS EXCELLENCY LIAQUAT ALI KHAN

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, May 4, 1950, it shall be in order at any time for the Speaker to declare a recess in order that the House may receive His Excellency Liaquat Ali Khan, the Prime Minister of Pakistan.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

REPORT OF WAR CLAIMS COMMISSION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 580)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed, with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of section 8 of the War Claims Act of 1948, I transmit herewith the report of the War Claims Commission required by that section. In the absence of a thorough review by interested departments and agencies, the report should be considered as representing only the views of the War Claims Commission and not my own views or those of the executive branch as a whole.

The intent of section 8 of the War Claims Act was clearly to provide for a thorough study and evaluation of all of the many types of claims arising from World War II so that legislation dealing with the war-claims problem could be considered as a whole rather than approached on a piecemeal basis.

However, as the Commission points out in the opening paragraphs of its report, it has not had sufficient time to make the kind of study intended. While making certain specific legislative recommendations, the Commission was unable to be equally specific in other areas. Thus, Congress is still not provided with a comprehensive analysis of the total war-claims problem which is needed in order to make intelligent decisions in regard to individual types of claims. Such an analysis cannot be completed by the Commission without several more months of intensive study.

Under these circumstances, I recommend that legislation dealing with additional types of claims be limited at this session of Congress to that which may be necessary to enable the Commission to develop comprehensive recommendations as to what claims should be authorized in legislation and what the standards of eligibility should be. These recommendations should be submitted to me in time for full consideration by other interested departments and agencies and preparation of a coordinated set of recommendations from the executive branch to the Congress early in the next session of the Congress.

In the meantime, the Commission will, of course, proceed to adjudicate and pay those claims which have already been authorized by the Congress in the War Claims Act of 1948.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 3, 1950.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN RIVER AND HARBOR WORK

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5472) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement follow:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1968)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5472) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 65, 66, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 85, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 156, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 7, lines 19 and 20, strike out "in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated July 13, 1949;" and insert in lieu thereof the following, "Senate Document Numbered 117, Eighty-first Congress; and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$21,300,000 for the initial and partial accomplishment of the project;"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 8, line 2, strike out the figure "\$89,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "\$80,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 11, lines 9, 10, and 11, strike out the words "in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated June 28, 1949;," and insert in lieu thereof "House Document Numbered 531, Eighty-first Congress;"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 15, line 14, change the date "June 30, 1949" to "June 30, 1950"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 22, line 22, after the comma, insert the following: "consisting of approximately

one thousand and nine hundred linear feet of pressure conduit and seven hundred feet of earth dike", and, on line 24, delete the period at the end of the sentence and substitute a comma in lieu thereof and add the following: "Provided, That the provisions of local cooperation applicable to the Hartford, Connecticut, project heretofore authorized, as amended, are applicable to this modification at an estimated cost to local interests of \$150,000;"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 67: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 24, line 6, change the figure "\$68,377,000" to "\$50,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 73: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 30, line 3, strike out the comma after the word "times"; line 4, strike out the words "sixty-nine thousand acre-feet of"; line 5, strike out the period at the end of the sentence and add the following: "as authorized by existing law;"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 82: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 82, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 36, line 12, after the comma following "1948", insert the following: "in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers contained in House Document Numbered 185, Eighty-first Congress"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 83: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 83, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 37, line 2, change the period to a comma and add the following: "as set forth in House Document Numbered 243, Eighty-first Congress;"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 84: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 37, line 8, strike out the following: "dated September 12, 1949" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "as contained in House Document Numbered 530, Eighty-first Congress"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 86: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 86, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 37, line 20, after the comma following "1949", insert the following: "and the Chief of Engineers in his report dated December 12, 1949;"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 87: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 87, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 38, line 24, strike out the following: "dated June 27, 1948" and insert in lieu thereof "as contained in House Document Numbered 367, Eighty-first Congress"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 88: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 88, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 39, line 15, after the comma following "1949", insert the following: "and as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in his report dated November 15, 1949;"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendments numbered 89 through 106, inclusive: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 89 through 106, inclusive, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the language in the said amendments and in lieu thereof, on page 45, after line 10, add the following paragraphs:

"In addition to previous authorizations and authorizations herein, the projects listed below for flood control and other purposes in the Columbia River Basin (including the Willamette River Basin) substantially in accordance with the plans recommended in the report of the Chief of Engineers dated June 28, 1949, and approved in the letter dated February 1, 1950, from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget for construction by the Corps of Engineers, both contained in House Document Numbered 531, Eighty-first Congress, second session, are hereby approved, and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$75,000,000 for the partial accomplishment of those projects and for the continued prosecution of the comprehensive plan for the Willamette River Basin approved in the Act of June 28, 1938, as amended and supplemented by subsequent acts of Congress:

"Power facilities at Lookout Point Dam, Middle Fork of the Willamette River, Oregon.

"Hills Creek Dam, Middle Fork of Willamette River, Oregon.

"Dexter reregulating dam, Middle Fork, Willamette River, Oregon.

"Waldo Lake Tunnel and regulating works, Middle Fork-North Fork, Willamette River, Oregon.

"Fall Creek Dam, Fall Creek, Middle Fork, Willamette River, Oregon.

"Holley Dam, Calapooya River, Oregon.

"Willamette Falls Fish Ladder, Willamette River, Oregon.

"Willamette River channel improvements, bank protection works, and channel clearing and snagging.

"Libby Dam, Kootenai River, Montana.

"Priest Rapids Dam, Columbia River, Washington.

"John Day Dam, Columbia River, Washington and Oregon.

"The Dalles Dam, Columbia River, Washington and Oregon.

"Local flood protection project at Pendleton, Oregon, and Jackson Hole, Wyoming.

"Local flood protection projects in the Columbia River Basin, Montana, Wyoming, Utah, Nevada, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington, provided that with respect to these local flood protection projects the following conditions shall apply:

"(1) Not to exceed \$15,000,000 of this authorization shall be available for these local flood protection projects.

"(2) All of the local flood protection projects undertaken pursuant to this item shall be economically justified prior to construction.

"(3) Local cooperation specified in the Flood Control Act approved June 22, 1936, as amended shall be required."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 147: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 147, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 55, line 15, change the figure "\$1,337,000,000" to "\$1,250,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 154: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 154, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 58, beginning with line 5, strike out all of section 219, and insert on page 49, between lines 20 and 21, the following:

"Arkansas, White and Red River Basins, Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico, Colorado, Kansas, and Missouri, with a view to developing comprehensive, integrated plans of improvement for navigation, flood control, domestic and municipal water supplies, reclamation and irrigation, development and utilization of hydroelectric power, conservation of soil, forest and fish and wildlife resources, and other beneficial development and utilization of water resources including such consideration of recreation uses, salinity and sediment control, and pollution abatement as may be provided

for under Federal policies and procedures, all to be coordinated with the Department of the Interior, the Department of Agriculture, the Federal Power Commission, other appropriate Federal agencies and with the States, as required by existing law: *Provided*, That Federal projects now constructed and in operation, under construction, authorized for construction, or projects that may be hereafter authorized substantially in accordance with reports currently before or that may hereafter come before the Congress, if in compliance with the first section of an Act entitled "An Act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and other purposes", approved December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887), shall not be altered, changed, restricted, delayed, retarded, or otherwise impeded or interfered with by reason of this paragraph."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 155: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 155, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 70, line 3, change the figure "220" to "219"; and the Senate agree to the same.

WILL M. WHITTINGTON,

HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.,

CLIFFORD DAVIS,

GEO. A. DONDERO,

HOMER D. ANGELL,

Managers on the Part of the House.

DENNIS CHAVEZ,

JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,

SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,

HARRY P. CAIN,

GEO. W. MALONE,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5472) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Title I of the bill, Rivers and Harbors, as it passed the House carried authorizations for 65 projects in the amount of \$119,469,975. The Senate by amendments added 29 navigation projects costing \$108,903,150, making a grand total of \$228,373,125 for rivers and harbors. The navigation projects added by the Senate were based on reports which were recommended by the Chief of Engineers but were not submitted to Congress in time for consideration by the House committee, as shown by the Senate hearings, before the bill was reported to the House. The conferees feel that they should now be included, since they have been submitted to Congress and heard and considered by the Senate committee.

Title II of the bill, Flood Control, as it passed the House carried authorizations for 22 new flood-control projects and for 18 modifications of authorized projects in a total amount of \$998,116,200. The Senate, by amendments, added 18 projects and modified or extended 6 projects contained in the House bill in a total amount of \$366,384,000, which includes \$30,179,000 for reclamation

work on the Rio Grande, making a grand total of \$1,334,321,200 for flood control. The new flood-control projects added by the Senate were, as in title I, based on reports which were recommended by the Chief of Engineers, but were not submitted to Congress in time for consideration by the House committee, as shown by the Senate hearings, before the bill was reported to the House. As in connection with title I the conferees agree that these new projects should now be included since they have been submitted to Congress and heard and considered by the Senate committee.

The results of the conference are as follows:

For rivers and harbors the total additional amounts of \$108,903,150, as passed by the Senate, were reduced by agreement among the conferees by \$24,650,000, representing reductions in authorizations for the Ouachita and Arkansas Rivers. The total additional amount for rivers and harbors, therefore, included by the Senate and agreed to in conference, is \$84,253,150.

With respect to flood control, the total additional amounts added by the Senate of \$366,384,000, of which \$30,179,000 is for work to be prosecuted by the Bureau of Reclamation, were reduced by \$84,630,000, representing reductions in authorizations for the Savannah River Basin and the Columbia River Basin including the Willamette River Basin. The total additional amount, therefore, added by the Senate and agreed to in conference, for flood control, is \$251,575,000.

As the bill passed the House the following projects were included under Title I—Rivers and Harbors:

Items (sec. 101, unless otherwise indicated)

Projects	Document number ¹	Federal cost of new work	Annual maintenance	Projects	Document number ¹	Federal cost of new work	Annual maintenance
Searboro River, Maine, between Prouts Neck and Pine Point.	H. 69, 81st Cong.	\$133,570	\$3,600	Palm Beach, Fla., beach erosion.	H. 772, 80th Cong.	\$7,500	-----
Wood Island Harbor, Maine, and the Pool at Biddeford.	H. 49, 81st Cong.	68,700	3,240	Lake Worth Inlet, Fla.	H. 704, 80th Cong.	305,000	\$1,000
Winthrop Beach, Mass., beach-erosion control.	H. 764, 80th Cong.	216,000	(?)	Charlotte Harbor, Fla.	H. 186, 81st Cong.	214,000	(3)
Mystic River, Mass.	H. 645, 80th Cong.	2,908,000	4,000	St. Petersburg Harbor, Fla.	H. 70, 81st Cong.	208,300	4,000
Mattapoisett Harbor, Mass.	H. 664, 80th Cong.	33,000	1,500	Horseshoe Cove, Fla.	H. 106, 81st Cong.	194,000	5,000
Stonington Harbor, Conn.	H. 667, 80th Cong.	34,500	1,500	La Grange Bayou, Fla.	H. 190, 81st Cong.	99,000	2,500
Eightmile River, Conn.	H. 666, 80th Cong.	18,000	1,000	Fly Creek, Fairhope, Ala.	H. 194, 81st Cong.	14,000	2,000
Fire Island Inlet, N. Y.	H. 762, 80th Cong.	228,000	85,000	Pascagoula Harbor, Dog River Cut-off, Miss.	H. 188, 81st Cong.	41,000	(3)
East Chester Creek (Hutchinson River), N. Y.	H. 749, 80th Cong.	664,000	4,800	Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma.	H. 758, 79th Cong.	70,000,000	(4)
Jamaica Bay, N. Y.	H. 665, 80th Cong.	377,000	7,500	Sabine-Neches waterway, Texas, vicinity of Port Arthur Bridge.	H. 174, 81st Cong.	609,270	1,000
Arthur Kill, N. Y. and N. J.	H. 223, 81st Cong.	11,591,000	(6)	Galveston Harbor and Channel, Tex. (sea wall).	H. 173, 81st Cong.	5,550,000	(?)
Sandy Hook Bay at Leonardo, N. J.	H. 108, 81st Cong.	45,000	7,500	Gulf Intracoastal Waterway in South Galveston Bay, Tex.	H. 196, 81st Cong.	300,000	20,000
Lake Okeleto and Walnut Lake, Anne Arundel County, Md.	H. 712, 80th Cong.	76,000	1,000	Chocolate and Bastrop Bayous, Tex.	H. 768, 80th Cong.	-----	26,000
Hellens Creek, Calvert County, Md.	H. 663, 80th Cong.	10,400	1,000	Freeport Harbor, Tex.	H. 195, 81st Cong.	356,000	-----
Governors Run, Calvert County, Md.	H. 670, 80th Cong.	59,450	2,000	Little Bay, Tex.	H. 114, 81st Cong.	\$29,800	3,000
Saint Patricks Creek, Md.	H. 671, 80th Cong.	18,200	4,800	Brazos Island Harbor, Tex.	H. 192, 81st Cong.	3,050,000	60,600
Potomac River and tributaries at and below Washington, D. C., elimination of water-chestnut.	H. 113, 81st Cong.	-----	9,470	Trinity River, at Dallas and Fort Worth, Tex.	H. 242, 81st Cong.	3,410,000	(4)
Kings Creek, Northampton County, Va.	H. 193, 81st Cong.	93,000	9,500	Mississippi River at Hannibal, Mo.	H. 67, 81st Cong.	50,420	1,420
Rappahannock River at Bowlers Wharf, Essex County, Va.	H. 109, 81st Cong.	118,000	2,800	Mississippi River at Davenport, Iowa.	H. 642, 80th Cong.	91,200	100
James River, Va.	H. 191, 81st Cong.	-----	46,000	Mississippi River at Muscatine, Iowa.	H. 733, 80th Cong.	129,495	900
Inland waterway in vicinity of Fairfield, N. C.	H. 723, 80th Cong.	112,400	(?)	Mississippi River at Clinton, Iowa.	S. 197, 80th Cong.	257,770	-----
Far Creek, N. C.	H. 770, 80th Cong.	80,600	6,000	Mississippi River at Prairie du Chien, Wis.	H. 71, 81st Cong.	131,100	1,100
Waterway from Pamlico Sound to Beaufort Harbor, N. C., harbor improvement at Marshallberg.	H. 68, 81st Cong.	19,400	750	Hudson Harbor, St. Croix River, Wis.	H. 60, 81st Cong.	29,500	100
Taylor Creek, N. C.	H. 111, 81st Cong.	82,200	4,500	Grand Marais Harbor, Minn.	H. 184, 81st Cong.	58,100	100
Cape Fear River and below Wilmington, N. C.	H. 87, 81st Cong.	1,331,000	(?)	Kenosha Harbor, Wis.	H. 187, 81st Cong.	114,000	1,500
Savannah River, Ga. and S. C.	S. 6, 81st Cong.	3,137,000	236,900	Manistique Harbor, Mich.	H. 760, 80th Cong.	4,500	(?)
Brunswick Harbor, Ga.	H. 110, 81st Cong.	1,532,000	40,000	Grand Marais Harbor, Mich.	H. 751, 80th Cong.	398,000	(?)
Saint Marys River, Ga. and Fla., and North River, Ga.	H. 680, 80th Cong.	918,600	18,000	Detroit River, Mich., Trenton Channel.	S. 30, 81st Cong.	1,356,800	1,000
Fernandina Harbor, Fla.	H. 662, 80th Cong.	242,000	5,000	Toledo Harbor, Ohio.	H. 189, 81st Cong.	329,900	4,000
Saint Augustine Harbor and vicinity, Florida.	H. 133, 81st Cong.	1,892,200	11,600	Redwood City Harbor, Redwood Creek, Calif.	H. 104, 81st Cong.	322,000	14,000
				San Joaquin River and Stockton Channel, Calif.	H. 752, 80th Cong.	4,214,000	(?)
				Westport slough, Oregon.	H. 134, 81st Cong.	112,000	8,500
				Columbia slough, Oregon.	(?)	905,100	16,700
				Christiansted Harbor, St. Croix, V. I.	H. 771, 80th Cong.	261,600	5,000
				Total.		119,469,975	608,480

¹ "H" indicates House document, "S" indicates Senate document.

² None required.

³ No additional maintenance cost.

⁴ Additional authorizations.

⁵ Report of Chief of Engineers dated Dec. 28, 1948.

List of projects added to title I of the bill by Senate amendments to which the House concurred:

Items added (sec. 101)

Projects	Document number ¹	Estimated cost	Projects	Document number ¹	Estimated cost
Ash Creek to Saugatuck River, Conn., beach erosion.	H. 454, 81st Cong.	\$203,500	Biloxi Harbor, Miss.	H. 256, 81st Cong.	0
Shrewsbury River, N. J.	H. 285, 81st Cong.	363,000	Ouachita River, Ark. and La.	S. 117, 81st Cong.	\$21,300,000
Waterway from Indian River Inlet to Rehoboth Bay, Del.	H. 304, 81st Cong.	85,000	Arkansas River, Ark. and Okla.	H. 758, 79th Cong.	\$10,000,000
Twitche Cove, Big Thoroughfare River, and Levering Creek, Md.	H. 340, 81st Cong.	21,000	Mississippi River at Hamburg, Ill.	H. 254, 81st Cong.	50,400
Colonial Beach, Va., beach erosion.	H. 333, 81st Cong.	35,000	Mississippi River at Rock Island, Ill.	H. 257, 81st Cong.	18,600
Quincy Creek, Va.	H. 241, 81st Cong.	116,000	Monongahela River, Pa. and W. Va.	S. 100, 81st Cong.	29,238,000
Davis Creek, Va.	H. 309, 81st Cong.	85,000	Bayfield Harbor, Wis.	H. 260, 81st Cong.	119,000
Winter Harbor, Va.	H. 319, 81st Cong.	205,000	Cheboygan River and Harbor, Mich.	H. 269, 81st Cong.	163,000
Channel from Manteo to Oregon Inlet, N. C.	H. 310, 81st Cong.	860,500	Port Bay, N. Y.	H. 293, 81st Cong.	466,600
Masonboro Inlet to ocean, Cape Fear River, N. C.	H. 341, 81st Cong.	1,980,000	Redondo Beach, Calif.	H. 303, 81st Cong.	3,456,000
Tampa Harbor, Fla.	H. 258, 81st Cong.	7,787,000	San Francisco Harbor and Bay, Calif.	H. 286, 81st Cong.	850,000
Hudson River, Fla.	H. 287, 81st Cong.	258,700	Bake Bay, Columbia River, Wash.	S. 95, 81st Cong.	442,000
Channel and turning basin, Ozona, Fla.	H. 326, 81st Cong.	70,100	Columbia River at Umatilla, Oreg.	H. 531, 81st Cong.	416,250
Gulf, Intracoastal Waterway from Big Lagoon to Pensacola, Fla.	H. 325, 81st Cong.	88,000	Kawaihae Harbor, T. H.	H. 311, 81st Cong.	5,525,500
			Hampton Roads, Norfolk Harbor, Va. (sec. 102)		50,000
			Total		84,253,150

¹ "H." indicates House document, "S" indicates Senate document.² Increased authorization.

TITLE II—FLOOD CONTROL

List of projects in bill as passed by the House:

Items (sec. 204)

Project	Document number	New flood-control projects	Increases in authorizations for previously approved projects	Project	Document number	New flood-control projects	Increases in authorizations for previously approved projects
Lackawaxen River Basin, Pa.	H. Doc. 113, 80th Cong., 1st sess.		\$6,000,000	South Platte River Basin, Colo.	H. Doc. 669, 80th Cong., 2d sess.	\$26,300,000	
Anacostia River, D. C. and Md.	H. Doc. 202, 81st Cong., 1st sess.	\$4,531,200		Elkhorn River Basin, Nebr.	H. Doc. 215, 81st Cong., 1st sess.	2,428,000	
Savannah River Basin.	H. Doc. 657, 78th Cong., 1st sess.	40,000,000		Mandan, N. Dak.	H. Doc. 294, 79th Cong., 1st sess.		\$76,000
Central and southern Florida.	H. Doc. 643, 80th Cong., 2d sess.	10,000,000		Ohio River Basin.			75,000,000
Red River backwater area.			15,000,000	Orleans, Ind.	H. Doc. 105, 81st Cong., 1st sess.	292,000	
St. Francis River Basin, Mo. and Ark.	H. Doc. 132, 81st Cong., 1st sess.	20,000,000		Bradford, Pa.	S. Doc. 20, 81st Cong., 1st sess.	6,467,000	
Cache River Basin, Ark. and Mo.	S. Doc. 88, 81st Cong., 1st sess.	10,000,000		Wabash River—New Harmony Bridge, Ind. and Ill.	H. Doc. 197, 80th Cong., 1st sess.		500,000
Emergency fund (lower Mississippi River Basin).			5,000,000	Red River of the North Basin.			4,000,000
Lower Mississippi River Basin Authorization.			200,000,000	Rio Grande Basin.			34,000,000
Lake Ponchartrain, La.	(¹)	4,050,000		Santa Ana River, Calif.	H. Doc. 135, 81st Cong., 1st sess.	15,092,000	
Calion, Ark.	H. Doc. 427, 76th Cong., 1st sess.		430,000	Los Angeles and San Gabriel Basins.			40,000,000
Genesee River, N. Y.	H. Doc. 232, 81st Cong., 1st sess.	609,000		Willamette River Basin.			40,000,000
Arkansas River Basin.			15,000,000	Johnson Creek, Oreg.	(¹)	332,000	
Grand (Neosho) River, Okla., Kans., Mo. and Ark.	H. Doc. 442, 80th Cong., 1st sess.	36,220,000		Portland, Oreg.	(²)	14,000,000	
Grand Prairie region and Bayou Meto Basin, Ark.	H. Doc. —, 81st Cong., 1st sess.	6,000,000		Albani Falls, Idaho.	S. Doc. 9, 81st Cong., 1st sess.	31,070,000	
White River Basin.			35,000,000	Lower Columbia River bank protection.	(²)	4,900,000	
Upper Mississippi River Basin.			15,000,000	Modification of existing projects in lower Columbia River.	(²)	14,722,000	
Canton, Mo.	H. Doc. 107, 81st Cong., 1st sess.	1,086,000		Levees along lower Columbia River.	(²)	2,973,000	
Cape Girardeau, Mo.	H. Doc. 204, 81st Cong., 1st sess.	4,756,000		Kawainui swamp, Hawaii.	H. Doc. 214, 81st Cong., 1st sess.	848,000	
Missouri River Basin.			250,000,000				
Yellowstone River, Wyo., Mont. and N. Dak.	H. Doc. 216, 81st Cong., 1st sess.	6,524,000		Total		213,110,000	785,006,000
				Grand total		998,116,200	

² Report of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors dated Feb. 21, 1949 (H. Doc. 531, 81st Cong.).

List of projects added to title II of the bill by Senate amendments to which the House concurred:

Items added (sec. 204): Flood control

Projects	Document number	Estimated Federal cost	Projects	Document number	Estimated Federal cost
Hartford, Conn.		¹ \$239,000	Barbourville, Ky.	H. 345, 81st Cong.	\$1,765,000
Monkey Run at Corning, N. Y.	H. 305, 81st Cong.	12,370,000	Cumberland, Ky.	do.	67,000
Pasquotank River, N. C.	H. 306, 81st Cong.	110,000	Red River of the North Basin.		4,000,000
Hartwell Dam, Savannah River, Ga.	H. 657, 78th Cong.	10,000,000	Rio Grande Basin.		² 5,000,000
Central and southern Florida.		10,000,000	Meadow Valley Wash, Muddy River, Nev.	(²)	1,986,000
Grants Canal, Lake Providence, La.		11,000	Painted Rock Reservoir, Gila River, Ariz.	H. 331, 81st Cong.	25,800,000
Amite River bank protection, Louisiana.		50,000	Humboldt River, Nev.	(¹)	7,679,000
Des Arc, Ark.	H. 485, 81st Cong.	228,000	Sacramento River Basin.		3,500,000
Oklahoma City floodway, Oklahoma.		¹ 10,460,000	Russian River, Calif.	(¹)	11,552,000
Pueblo, Colo.	H. 327, 81st Cong.	209,000	Columbia River Basin, including Willamette River Basin.	H. 531, 81st Cong.	75,000,000
Keystone Reservoir, Arkansas River, Okla.	S. 107, 81st Cong.	37,273,000	Eagle Gorge Reservoir, Green River, Wash.	H. 271, 81st Cong.	16,300,000
Illinois River at Beardstown, Ill.	H. 332, 81st Cong.	2,976,000			
Ohio River Basin.		25,000,000	Total		² 251,575,000

¹ Modification of previously authorized project.² \$30,179,000 of this amount does not include work to be prosecuted by the Bureau of Reclamation.³ Report of Chief of Engineers dated Sept. 12, 1949.⁴ Reports of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors dated Apr. 22, 1949.

The following is an explanation of each of the Senate amendments, some of which cover minor amendments:

Amendment No. 1, Winthrop Beach, Mass., beach erosion control: Due to emergency, local interests performed certain work at their own expense, which work was in accordance with the recommended plan for which it is proposed that local interests be reimbursed, such reimbursement not to exceed the cost as if the work had been performed by the Federal Government. House conferees recede.

Amendment No. 2, Ash Creek to Saugatuck (area 1), Conn.: Item adopts project recommended by the Chief of Engineers authorizing Federal participation in the amount of one-third of the first cost of protective and improvement measures for Jennings, Sasco Hill, Southport and Burial Hill Beaches, Sherwood Island State Park, and Compo Beach. The total cost of the project is estimated at \$610,500 with the Federal share estimated at \$203,500. House conferees recede.

Amendment No. 3, Shrewsbury River, N. J.: Item adopts project recommended by the Chief of Engineers to provide for a shallow draft channel and turning basin at an estimated cost to the United States of \$363,000. House conferees recede.

Amendment No. 4, waterway from Indian River Inlet to Rehoboth Bay, Del.: Item adopts project recommended by the Chief of Engineers to provide for a channel 6 feet deep from Rehoboth Beach to water of the same depth in Indian River Bay by way of Big Ditch. Estimated cost to United States, \$85,000. House conferees recede.

Amendment No. 5, Twitch Cove, Big Thorougfare River, and Levering Creek, Md.: Item adopts project recommended by the Chief of Engineers to provide modification of the existing project by the provision of an anchorage basin 7 feet deep, 100 feet wide, and 700 feet long, connecting with the existing channel at Ewell and an extension of the existing channel in Levering Creek 6 feet deep, 60 feet wide, and 1,000 feet long. Cost to the United States is \$21,000. House conferees recede.

Amendment No. 6, shore protection at Colonial Beach, Va.: Item adopts project recommended by the Chief of Engineers to provide protective measures at Colonial Beach. Cost to the United States is \$35,000, which is one-third of the total cost of the project. House conferees recede.

Amendment No. 7, Quinby Creek, Accomack County, Va.: Item adopts project recommended by Chief of Engineers to provide for a channel 8 feet deep to Quinby Landing with a mooring basin of same depth. Cost to the United States is \$116,000. House conferees recede.

Amendment No. 8, Davis Creek, Mathews County, Va.: Item adopts project recommended by the Chief of Engineers to provide a channel 10 feet deep with a mooring basin of the same depth. Cost to the United States is \$85,000. House conferees recede.

Amendment No. 9, Winter Harbor, Mathews County, Va.: Item adopts project recommended by the Chief of Engineers to provide a 12-foot channel leading from Chesapeake Bay to a mooring basin of the same depth. Cost to the United States is \$205,000. House conferees recede.

Amendment No. 10, channel from Manteo to Oregon Inlet, N. C.: Item adopts project recommended by the Chief of Engineers to provide for a bar channel 14 feet deep in Pamlico Sound and in Oregon Inlet to and including a turning basin of the same depth and a side channel 12 feet deep from the Manteo-Oregon Inlet Channel in Roanoke Sound to wharves in Mill Creek near Wanchese, including a turning basin. Cost to the United States is \$860,500. House conferees recede.

Amendment No. 11, Masonboro Inlet to Ocean, N. C.: Item adopts project recommended by the Chief of Engineers to provide for initial stage construction consisting of a channel 14 feet deep over the ocean bar at Masonboro Inlet thence 12 feet deep to the channel of the inland waterway at Wrightsville by way of Banks and Motte Channels, and a turning basin 15 feet deep on the east side of Banks Channel near the inlet with three 15-pile tie-up dolphins. If experience shows that it is impracticable to maintain the proposed channels and turning basin by dredging alone, a final stage of construction, consisting of jetties on each side of the bar channel across the inlet is proposed. Cost to the United States is \$390,000 for initial stage; \$1,980,000 for final stage. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 12, Palm Beach, Fla., beach erosion control: Correct typographical error.

Amendment No. 13, Lake Worth Inlet, Fla.: A portion of the harbor is maintained by local interests by periodic dredging. The Federal project recommended in House Document 704, Eightieth Congress, provides for extension of the existing turning basin. This extension was required to accommodate increased vessel traffic. Dredges operating in the area under contract to local interests were able to do the work at a saving in cost of mobilization and demobilization of the dredge equipment. The work was so performed in accordance with the project modification. Reimbursement to local interests for the cost of the work performed, not to exceed the sum of \$305,000, is recommended. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 14, Tampa Harbor, Fla.: Item adopts project recommended by Chief of Engineers to provide deepening of Egmont Channel to 36 feet; enlarging Mullet Key Cut to a depth of 34 feet and width of 500 feet; enlarging Tampa Bay, Hillsboro Bay, and Port Tampa Channels to a depth of 34 feet and a width of 400 feet; enlarging Port Tampa turning basin to a depth of 34 feet and a width of 750 feet; deepening Sparkman Channel and Ybor turning basin to 34 feet; revoking the authorized improvement of Alafia River and substituting in lieu thereof a channel 30 feet deep and 230 feet wide from Hillsboro Bay Channel to and including the existing turning basin to be enlarged to a depth of 30 feet, a width of 700 feet, and a length of 1,200 feet. Cost to the United States is \$7,780,000. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 15, Hudson River, Fla.: Item adopts project recommended by Chief of Engineers to provide for a channel 6 feet deep from the Gulf of Mexico to the head of Hudson River. Cost to the United States is \$258,700. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 16, channel and turning basin at Ozona, Fla.: Item adopts project recommended by Chief of Engineers to provide a 6-foot channel from the authorized Intracoastal Waterway, Caloosahatchee River to Anclote River, Fla., to and including a turning basin 6 feet deep. Cost to the United States is \$70,100. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 17, Gulf Intracoastal Waterway from Big Lagoon to Pensacola Bay, Fla.: Item adopts project recommended by the Chief of Engineers to provide for abandonment and closure of existing channel between Big Lagoon and Pensacola Bay, and construction of a new channel 12 feet deep and 125 feet wide from existing channel in Big Lagoon to Pensacola Bay. Cost to United States is \$88,000. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 18, Biloxi Harbor, Miss.: Item adopts project recommended by the Chief of Engineers to provide for assumption by the United States of maintenance to a depth of 6 feet and a width of 40 feet of the existing channel from the main channel in Biloxi Harbor to the entrance of Ott Bayou. Cost to the United States, none for new work. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 19, Ouachita River and tributaries, Arkansas and Louisiana (S. Doc. No. 117, 81st Cong.): Item adopts project as approved by the Senate providing for modernization of the navigation channel for the Red River to the mouth of the Black River thence from the mouth of the Black River to Camden, Ark., mile 351, on the Ouachita River, to be obtained by lengthening the existing six locks to 525 feet and deepening them to accommodate 9-foot draft navigation, also provides for channel realignment, cut-offs where necessary, rehabilitation of the dams and contraction works. The project also provides for a comprehensive plan of improvement for flood control, power production, and other purposes on the Ouachita River and tributaries, to include, in addition to all existing projects and portions thereof in the basin above the lower end of the levees on the east bank of the Ouachita, the following improvements: (1) Construction of the DeGray multiple-purpose reservoir on Caddo River, and the Murfreesboro flood-control reservoir on Muddy Fork of Little Missouri River; (2) extension of the flood wall at Monroe, La.; (3) construction of a levee and appurtenant works for flood protection of Bawcombville, La.; and (4) channel improvement and closure of high-water outlets on Bayou Bartholomew, Ark. and La., channel improvement on the tributary Pine Bluff outlet canal, construction of an intercepting canal from the head of Harding drain to Bayou Bartholomew, and channel improvements of Deep Bayou and Overflow Creek. Total cost to the United States is \$36,950,000, which includes \$13,900,000 for a 9-foot navigation channel. The House conferees recede from their disagreement to the amendment and agree to a substitute amendment. The substitute amendment reduces the amount of the authorization as originally proposed by the Senate from \$36,950,000 to \$21,300,000. This authorization will be available for the local protection projects at Bawcombville, Monroe, and Bayou Bartholomew, Pine Bluff outlet canal, Deep Bayou and Overflow Creek; for the DeGray Reservoir and navigation improvements. It is the understanding of the conferees that the Murfreesboro Reservoir will be deferred pending a further showing of the need and justification.

Amendment No. 20, Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Louisiana: The House conferees recede from their disagreement to the amendment and agree to same with an amendment which provides for a reduction in the amount authorized. This amendment reduces the Senate figure from \$89,000,000 to \$80,000,000 for the further accomplishment of the approved plan for the Arkansas River and tributaries (H. Doc. No. 758, 79th Cong.), it being the understanding of the conferees that of this amount not to exceed \$30,000,000 may be used for bank stabilization works at any location on the Arkansas and Verdigris Rivers from the mouth of the Arkansas River to Catoosa, Okla.

Amendment No. 21, Trinity River at Dallas and Fort Worth, Tex.: This amendment authorizes the document number to be inserted. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 22, Mississippi boat harbor opposite Hamburg, Ill.: Item adopts project recommended by the Chief of Engineers to provide for a small-boat harbor on the Missouri side of the river opposite Hamburg, Ill., with an entrance channel 6 feet deep and appurtenant works. Cost to the United States, \$50,400. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 23, Mississippi River at Rock Island, Ill.: Item adopts project recommended by the Chief of Engineers to provide a small-boat harbor in Lake Potter at downstream limits of the city of Rock Island, Ill., by deepening and widening en-

trance channels to the Mississippi River into Lake Potter to a depth of 6 feet and a width of 100 feet. Cost to the United States is \$18,600. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 24, Monongahela River, W. Va. and Pa.: Item adopts project recommended by the Chief of Engineers to provide for replacement of locks and dams 12 to 15, inclusive, by two locks and dams of higher lift with single lock chambers having usable dimensions 84 feet by 600 feet; construction of movable crest gates on dam 8 to increase the pool elevation; and construction of a navigable channel 9 feet deep and 300 feet wide from lock and dam 8 to the head of the river and thence of the same depth, and 200 feet wide where attainable, for a distance of about 2.1 miles up Tygart River. Cost to the United States is \$29,238,000. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 25, Bayfield Harbor, Wis.: Item adopts project recommended by the Chief of Engineers to provide a small-boat harbor by dredging and protective works. Cost to the United States is \$199,000. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 26, Cheboygan River and Harbor, Mich.: Item adopts project recommended by the Chief of Engineers to provide for modifying existing project by deepening the channel and basin to 21 feet. Cost to the United States is \$163,000. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 27, Port Bay, N. Y.: Item adopts project recommended by Chief of Engineers to provide for channel 8 feet deep from Lake Ontario into Port Bay protected by arrowhead breakwaters. Cost to the United States is \$466,600. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 28, Redondo Beach Harbor, Calif.: Item adopts project recommended by the Chief of Engineers to provide for reconstruction of about 1,485 linear feet of the existing breakwater, construction of a 2,800-foot extension of the existing breakwater and a south breakwater 700 feet long; and for maintenance of the entire existing breakwater as reconstructed the breakwater extension, and the south breakwater. Cost to the United States is \$3,456,000. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 29, San Francisco Harbor and Bay, Calif.: Item adopts project recommended by the Chief of Engineers for the establishment of a separate project for collection and disposal of debris in the San Francisco Bay area. Cost to the United States is \$850,000. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 30, Baker Bay, Columbia River, Wash.: Item adopts project recommended by Chief of Engineers to provide for a mooring basin 10 and 12 feet deep, about 20 acres in extent, with protecting breakwaters; and for a west channel 10 feet deep connecting the basin with deep water in Columbia River. Cost to the United States is \$442,000. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 31, Columbia River at Umatilla, Oreg.: Item as amended, and as recommended by the Chief of Engineers, provides for removal of blocks and boulders between the waterfront at Umatilla, Oreg., and the navigation channel to provide for a depth of 7.5 feet at the present low-water datum. Cost to the United States is \$416,250. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 32, Kawaihae Harbor, Island of Hawaii: Item adopts project recommended by the Chief of Engineers to provide for adoption of a project for the improvement of Kawaihae Harbor to provide for a basin 35 feet deep below mean lower low water and 1,250 feet square with an entrance channel 40 feet deep, 400 feet wide, and approximately 2,900 feet long extending northwestward to deep water in the ocean; and a protective breakwater about 4,400 feet long with maximum crest elevation 13 feet above mean lower low water, of which the seaward 3,200 feet shall be protected by

heavy stone revetment. Cost to the United States is \$5,525,500. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 33, collection and removal of drift in Hampton Roads and the harbors of Norfolk and Newport News, Va.: Item adopts project recommended by Chief of Engineers to provide for the prosecution of a regular program for the collection and removal of drift from the Hampton Roads area as is now being carried out in New York and Baltimore Harbors. Initial cost to the United States is \$50,000. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 34, Chief Joseph Dam, Columbia River, Wash.: Provides for a change in section number. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 35, Kentuck and Otter Slough, Oreg.: This amendment provides authority to the State of Oregon acting through its highway department, and to a local drainage district and county court, to construct, maintain, and operate dams and dikes to control the flow of tidal waters into these sloughs at points suitable to the interest of navigation and in accordance with plans approved by Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army, in accordance with conditions and stipulations which they deem necessary. No cost to the United States is involved. Similar authorizations have been included in previous River and Harbor Acts. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 36: Provides for change in section number. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 37, Intracoastal Waterway from the Caloosahatchee River to Anclote River. This amendment would authorize the Chief of Engineers to select the most feasible route as an alternate for the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway in the vicinity of Venice, Fla. It is the understanding of the conferees that it does not eliminate the existing proviso that the cost of the selected route shall not exceed the cost of the original route. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 38, Red Fish Bay, Tex.: This amendment provides for changing the name of the navigation channel and turning basin in Red Fish Bay to Port Mansfield in honor of the late and distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors, Congressman Joseph J. Mansfield. This change is desired by the Governor of Texas, the Texas Legislature, and the citizens of the State. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 39, revision of compilation of preliminary examination, survey and review reports: This amendment authorizes the Secretary of the Army to prepare and transmit to Congress a compilation of these reports, the last previous one having been published as House Document 106, Seventy-sixth Congress. This compilation is of considerable value in the administrative work of the Corps of Engineers and to the congressional committees and the Members of Congress, as well as to other organizations interested in river and harbor and flood-control investigations. It is understood by the conferees that the information is already available and that the only expense will be for printing. The House conferees recede from their disagreement to the Senate amendment and concur to same with an amendment to bring the date of the compilation up to June 30, 1950, in lieu of June 30, 1949, in view of the lapse of time since the bill passed the House.

Amendment No. 40: This amendment authorizes the conveyance of bridges owned by the United States and maintained and operated by the Corps of Engineers to local interests and will operate to effect a considerable saving to the Federal Government. The House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 41: Provides for a change in section number. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 42: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Round

Pond Harbor, Maine. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 43: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Bass Harbor, Maine. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 44: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Sesuit Harbor, Mass. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 45: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of New Creek, Staten Island, N. Y. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 46: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Main Channel, leading from Turkey Point to Havre de Grace, Harford County, Md. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 47: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Severn River, with particular reference to Ringgold Cove, Anne Arundel County, Md. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 48: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Apes Hole Creek, Somerset County, Md. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 49: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Chincoteague Bay, with a view to establishing a harbor of refuge at Chincoteague, Accomack County, Va. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 50: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Middle Creek, N. C. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 51: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Choctawhatchee Bay, Fla.; small-boat channel at Bay Bridge. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 52: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Pensacola Bay, Fla., channel at Bayou Texar. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 53: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey to determine the feasibility of providing a permanent channel from the Gulf of Mexico into Fort Myers Beach, Estero Island, Fla. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 54: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of channels in Lake Minnetonka, Minn. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 55: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Seabeck Harbor, Hood Canal, Wash. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 56: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Eagle Harbor, Wash. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 57: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Port Townsend, Wash. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 58: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of coasts of the Hawaiian Islands with a view to the establishment of harbors for light draft vessels for refuge and other purposes. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 59: Provides for a change in section number. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 60: Provides for a change in section number. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 61: Provides for changing the citation of the River and Harbor Act of 1949 to the River and Harbor Act of 1950. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 62: Provides for changing the word "title" to "Act". House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 63: Provides for changing the word "title" to "Act". House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 64, Connecticut River basin: This amendment modifies the existing project for Hartford, Conn., in the Connecticut River Basin to provide for the Folly Brook dike and conduit consisting of 1,900 linear feet of pressure conduit and 700 feet of earth dike at an estimated cost to the United States of \$239,000, and at an estimated cost to local interests of \$150,000 to

cover the provisions of local cooperation applicable to the previously authorized project. The House conferees recede from their disagreement to the amendment and agree to the same with an amendment identifying the project by a description of the length of the dike and conduit and by inserting the estimated cost of local cooperation. This change was made to further identify the modification of the existing project and to make clear that the usual conditions of local cooperation are applicable.

Amendment No. 65, Susquehanna River Basin: This amendment modifies an existing project authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1936, which provides for local protection works on Chemung River at Corning, N. Y. The recommended modification provides for the improvement of Monkey Run Creek at Corning, N. Y., by the construction of an open flume and conduit between the existing works on Monkey Run Creek above Sixth Street and the Chemung River at Pine Street, together with auxiliary works consisting of storm sewer outlets and a pumping plant. The estimated cost to the United States for construction is \$2,370,000. Local interests must furnish the usual requirements of local cooperation and also contribute \$250,000 in cash or in an equivalent amount of construction or reconstruction work, and must also restore city streets and pavements over the flume and conduit and provide adequate pumping capacity for disposal of storm waters draining through the property of the Corning Glass Works and not intercepted by the project. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 66, Pasquotank River Basin: This amendment adopts a new project providing for the construction of a dike and other appurtenant structures for flood control and related purposes in the vicinity of the Pasquotank River at an estimated cost to the United States of \$109,900, subject to the provisions of local cooperation specified by present law with respect to local protection projects. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 67, Savannah River Basin: This amendment would increase the authorization for the construction of the Hartwell project in the Savannah River Basin from \$40,000,000 to \$63,377,000. House conferees recede from their disagreement to the amendment and agree to the same with an amendment reducing the amount of \$63,377,000 to \$50,000,000. The conferees considered that the reduced amount would be sufficient authorization for a 3-year period.

Amendment No. 68, central and southern Florida: This amendment would increase the additional authorization for the comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in central and southern Florida approved in the act of June 30, 1943, from \$10,000,000 to \$20,000,000. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 69, Orleans Parish levees: This amendment modifies the improvements contemplated by the Flood Control Act of May 15, 1928, by extending the scope to include such improvements in the parish of Orleans, La., and to permit retention of jurisdiction by the Board of Levee Commissioners of the Orleans Levee District, State of Louisiana, over the completed improvements covered by this amendment. The purpose of this amendment is to include these levees in the Federal project for the control of floods in the alluvial valley of the Mississippi River in the same manner as for other communities on the main stem of the Mississippi River in its alluvial valley. In this connection, for the purpose of clarification, the conferees considered and concluded that the project for Lake Pontchartrain, La., page 27, lines 1 through 20 of the bill which was not in conference is now adequately covered in and prescribed by Senate Document No. 139, Eighty-first Congress, which it is the

intent to authorize. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 70, Grants Canal, La.: The purpose of this amendment is to permit the Federal Government to fill a stagnant ditch which was dredged during the War Between the States and which has been partly filled by local interests. The conferees feel that the filling of the remainder of the ditch by the Federal Government to avoid the present health menace to the community is properly an item of Federal expense. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 71, Des Arc, Ark.: This amendment adopts a new project for flood protection at Des Arc, Ark., to alleviate present dangerous flood conditions in this area. The project would provide for construction of an earth levee, drainage facilities, pumping plants, diversion ditches, and sewer modifications. The total length would be about 1½ miles. The estimated cost to the United States is \$228,000, and local interests are required to assume the customary requirements of local cooperation required by existing law in connection with flood-control projects. The project is particularly necessary in view of the fact that completion of levees on the east bank of the White River presently authorized will increase the severity of floods in Des Arc. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 72, bank erosion on Amite River, La.: This amendment adopts an emergency bank protection project to prevent serious bank caving which has caused damage to Amite Cemetery, Livingston Parish, La., and which will continue to destroy graves unless checked. The project, which is estimated to cost \$50,000, provides for the construction of a cut-off channel and a pile deflection dike. The conferees consider that the necessary corrective measures proposed by this amendment should be undertaken. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 73, Arkansas River Basin, Optima Reservoir: This amendment provides that the conservation storage for irrigation now authorized by existing law to be maintained in the Canton Reservoir shall be achieved by coordinated design, construction, and operation of the three reservoir system comprising the Optima Reservoir, the Fort Supply Reservoir, and the Canton Reservoir. The amendment would result in an eventual reduction of flood control storage when silt encroachment in the reservoirs infringed on the total live storage capacity. The House conferees recede from their disagreement to the amendment and agree to the same with an amendment to maintain the integrity of the flood control storage provided at the expense of the Federal Government and to permit the conservation storage in the Canton Reservoir as authorized by existing law to be maintained insofar as practicable until such time as silt deposits threaten to encroach upon the capacity for flood control.

Amendment No. 74, Keystone Reservoir, Arkansas River and tributaries: This amendment modifies the general comprehensive plan for the Arkansas River Basin approved by the act of June 28, 1938, as amended, and by the River and Harbor Act of July 24, 1946, by substitution of Keystone Reservoir on the Arkansas River for the Mannford Reservoir on the Cimarron River and by the deletion of the Blackburn and Taft Reservoirs on the Arkansas River. The estimated cost of the Keystone Reservoir is \$89,500,000. The estimated cost of the Mannford, Blackburn, and Taft Reservoirs, as approved, was \$52,227,000. Although the difference in these costs is \$37,273,000, there will be an actual saving in excess of \$24,000,000 by the substitution of the one reservoir for the three because of the increase in costs since the three reservoirs were authorized. The project will also provide essentially complete protection

from floods on the Arkansas River from the Keystone site to the mouth of the Verdigris River and a much higher degree of protection downstream from that point than would be provided by the Mannford Reservoir and will permit a more flexible operation of the reservoir system with increased benefits and will effect savings in the costs of certain local protection projects. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 75, Oklahoma City, Okla.: This amendment provides for modification of the existing project which consists of levees along both banks of the North Canadian River by substitution of an improved channel through Oklahoma City. The estimated cost to the United States is \$10,460,000 and to local interests \$6,040,000. The conferees feel that the modification would result in a materially better project due to changed conditions. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 76, Arkansas River, Pueblo, Colo.: This amendment adopts a new project for a levee along the Arkansas River in the vicinity of Pueblo at an estimated cost to the United States of \$209,000, subject to the customary provisions of local cooperation required by existing law for local protection projects with special conditions applying to this project. The conferees note that local interests have expended about \$5,000,000 for flood protection works at Pueblo and consider the improvement well justified because of the protection afforded to this important railroad, industrial, and distribution center. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 77, Grand Prairie Region and Bayou Meto Basin, Ark.: This amendment inserts the proper document number left blank in the House bill. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 78, Illinois River at Beardstown, Ill.: This amendment adopts a new project providing for construction of a new section of flood wall to replace that lost and damaged and for raising, strengthening, and extending the remaining portion of the flood wall and levees, all located at Beardstown, Ill., on the south bank of the Illinois River, at an estimated cost to the United States of \$2,976,000, subject to the usual provisions of local cooperation required by existing law in connection with flood protection projects. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 79, Ohio River Basin: This amendment increases the monetary authorization for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for the Ohio River Basin from \$75,000,000 to \$100,000,000 to provide a sufficient monetary ceiling to permit the completion of projects under way and to permit the prosecution of the comprehensive plan. Initiation of work on new projects can be accomplished within the \$100,000,000 additional authorization by the excess of this authorization over the deficit in connection with the cost of projects completed or under way. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 80, Mining City Dam and Reservoir, Ky.: This amendment insures that the Mining City Dam and Reservoir in Kentucky or its alternates will not be constructed if such construction would have an adverse effect on Mammoth Cave National Park. The conferees understand that construction under existing authorization would be undertaken in such manner as to have no adverse effect upon the Mammoth Cave National Park. It is the understanding of the conferees that the purpose of the amendment is to emphasize the necessity of preserving this national park. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 81, Cumberland River, Ky. and Tenn.: This amendment adopts a new project providing for the protection of the towns of Cumberland and Barbourville, Ky., by channel improvements and a system of levees, subject to the customary provisions of local cooperation required by ex-

isting law in connection with flood protection improvements. The estimated cost to the United States for the Cumberland improvement is \$67,000, and for the Barbourville improvement, \$1,765,000. The conferees feel that improvements at these localities are feasible and justified. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 82, Red River of the North Basin: This amendment increases the amount adopted by the House from \$4,000,000 to \$8,000,000 which will be sufficient to complete the authorized project. The House conferees recede from their disagreement to the amendment and agree to the same with an amendment identifying the printed report for this project.

Amendment No. 83, Rio Grande Basin: This amendment increases the House amount by an additional \$5,000,000 which will be sufficient for completion of the Corps of Engineers' portion of the project. It also adds an authorization of \$30,179,000 for the work to be prosecuted by the Department of the Interior as provided for in the authorized project. The House conferees recede from their disagreement and agree to the amendment with an amendment identifying the printed report for the project.

Amendment No. 84, Colorado River Basin: This amendment adopts a project for flood control consisting of the Pine Canyon and Matthews Canyon Reservoirs in the Meadow Valley Wash Basin at an estimated Federal cost of \$1,986,000. This project has a favorable benefit to cost ratio of 1.32. The House conferees recede from their disagreement and agree to the amendment with an amendment identifying the report printed in House Document No. 530, Eighty-first Congress.

Amendment No. 85, Gila River Basin: This amendment adopts a new project for a flood-control basin, Painted Rock Reservoir on the Gila River, 126 river miles above Yuma, at an estimated cost to the United States of \$25,800,000, subject to the conditions that local interests must adjust all water-right claims and keep the flood channel of the Gila River downstream from the dam free from encumbrances. The conferees understand that the improvement is needed not only to prevent flood damage in the lower Gila River and lower Colorado River areas, but also in the Imperial Valley in California. The project according to representatives of the State Department and the International Boundary Commission is an integral part of the plan contemplated in the Mexican water treaty of 1944. The House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 86, Humboldt River Basin: This amendment adopts a new project on the Humboldt River and its tributaries in Nevada providing for three storage reservoirs, supplementary channel improvements, and a system of drainage canals and appurtenant works in the lower basin. The total estimated cost to the United States is \$7,679,000. Local interests must furnish assurances that they will provide the customary requirements of local cooperation covered by existing flood-control laws in connection with local protection projects, and must furnish certain supplementary cooperation in connection with the drainage improvements and the reservoirs, including the contribution of \$2,762,000 in cash toward the reservoir construction costs. The improvement is also subject to the conditions that local interests agree on the method of operation of the reservoirs. The conferees note that the Department of Interior and the Corps of Engineers agree that authorization would be desirable and necessary to permit the solution of the problems involved in arriving at satisfactory arrangements between local interests and the Federal agencies. The conferees also understand that construction of the reservoirs will not proceed until satisfactory arrangements are worked out among the Federal, State, and

local agencies for repayment of a proper portion of the cost allocation for conservation storage. The conferees understand that the channel improvements in the lower portion of the basin recommended by the Corps of Engineers have been coordinated fully with the works proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation and may be undertaken without affecting the other features of the plan. The conferees agree that the improvements are feasible and desirable and should be authorized at this time. The House conferees recede from their disagreement with the Senate amendment and agree to the same with an amendment providing for clarification and identification of the project by reference to the report of the Chief of Engineers.

Amendment No. 87, Sacramento River Basin: This amendment provides for modification of the flood-control project for the protection of Butte Basin authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1944. The proposed plan which is in the nature of interim protection provides for a levee bypass through Butte Basin so designed and constructed as to fit into and become a part of the authorized project. The estimated cost to the United States is \$3,500,000 and local interests must provide the usual local cooperation required by existing law in connection with local protection projects. The conferees feel that construction of this improvement to provide interim protection is fully justified and necessary prior to the completion of the previously authorized project. The House conferees recede from their disagreement to this amendment and agree to the same with an amendment identifying the project by including a reference to the appropriate House document number.

Amendment No. 88, Russian River Basin: This amendment adopts a new project providing for the immediate authorization as an initial stage, channel stabilization works on the Russian River and Coyote Valley Reservoir on the east fork of the Russian River. This initial stage would be part of an ultimate development which would involve increasing the storage capacity of Coyote Valley Reservoir and the construction of an additional reservoir on Dry Creek. The estimated cost to the United States of the initial stage is \$11,552,000 and local interests would be required to contribute \$5,598,000 in cash toward the reservoir construction. The conferees note, as developed during the hearings on this project before the Senate Committee on Public Works, that local interests are prepared to pay in full their share of the costs of the project allocable for water conservation storage and that the Interior Department has agreed that as soon as this payment is made the funds would be transferred from the Interior Department to the Corps of Engineers which is charged with the construction work, and that the interests of the Interior Department in the administration of the project would then be turned over to local interests for their own operation and administration. The House conferees recede from their disagreement to the Senate amendment and agree to the same with an amendment providing for clarification and identification of the project by reference to the report of the Chief of Engineers.

Amendments Nos. 89 to 106, inclusive, Columbia River Basin, including Willamette River: These amendments modify and augment previous authorizations for flood control, navigation, and other purposes in the Willamette River Basin and in the Columbia River Basin by authorizing additional improvements consisting of dams, power facilities and appurtenant works, levees, overflow-channel closures, channel improvements, bank protection works, channel clearing and snagging, improvements for preservation of fish, local protection works, and navigation harbors, all as specifically itemized in these amendments.

The conferees have given careful consideration to the amendments and to the general question of additional authorizations for improvements for flood control, navigation, and related purposes in the Columbia River Basin. The conferees feel that the development of the Pacific Northwest for these purposes in accordance with the plans of the Chief of Engineers as contained in House Document No. 531, Eighty-first Congress, recently transmitted to the Congress, is urgent because of the necessity of providing protection from major and devastating floods and because of meeting as soon as practicable the ever-increasing demands for hydroelectric power in the rapidly expanding economy of the area. The conferees feel further that approval of units which will fit into the over-all development should be recognized at this time.

The conferees agree that the intent and purpose of amendments 89 to 106, inclusive, can best be accomplished by approving those projects in the Senate amendments which are in the comprehensive plan of development as contained in House Document No. 531, Eighty-first Congress and have also been approved by the Bureau of the Budget and by authorizing for appropriation an amount which will be sufficient to start construction work on the most important units. The conferees note that the Director of the Bureau of the Budget in his letter dated February 1, 1950, transmitted the President's views on the Columbia River Basin projects, and although approving the greater number of projects included in the Senate amendments and also in House Document No. 531, Eighty-first Congress, excluded some as being not in accord with the program of the President at this time. The conferees feel that the projects which should be approved and for which partial authorization should be granted should be limited at this time to those included in the Senate amendments and approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

In this connection, the conferees note that the House bill and the Senate amendments include all projects of the Corps of Engineers which had Budget approval except for a few in the Willamette River Basin involving the construction of dams at alternative sites in substitution for dams previously authorized in the comprehensive Willamette River Basin plan which are no longer feasible of construction because of changed conditions principally due to World War II and the general expansion of the population in the Willamette River Basin, which have taken place in the period subsequent to authorization. In connection with the alternative dams at the Cougar, Blue River, and Green Peter sites approved by the Bureau of the Budget, the conferees are of the opinion that the Corps of Engineers has authority to construct these projects under existing law as alternatives for the projects originally authorized.

In connection with the projects in the Willamette and Columbia River Basins as contained in the House bill, the conferees note that the identification reference is to the report of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors dated February 21, 1949. These projects inserted by the House are a part of the comprehensive plan for the Columbia River Basin, including the Willamette River Basin, and are contained in House Document No. 531, Eighty-first Congress, which was not available at the time of passage of the House bill. Since these items were not the subject of conference, their proper identification by substituting House Document No. 531, Eighty-first Congress, in lieu of the report of the Board of Engineers could not be accomplished, but the conferees desire to make clear that these projects are in the House Document No. 531, Eighty-first Congress. The partial authorization of \$75,000,000 proposed in the substitute amendment of the conferees represents

a reduction from a total of \$141,253,000, which was the total of the authorizations in the Columbia and Willamette Basins contained in the Senate amendments. With respect to the projects in the Senate amendments, the proposed amendment of the conferees would result in elimination of the project for modification of Fern Ridge Dam, Oreg., the reduction of the total sum for local flood protection works on the Columbia Basin from \$28,000,000 to \$15,000,000, the elimination of the project for Hepner Dam, Oreg., and the elimination of the item for harbors at various locations in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho.

House conferees recede from their disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 89 to 106, inclusive, and agree to the same with an amendment which strikes out the language now contained in Senate amendments Nos. 89 through 106, inclusive, and substitutes in lieu thereof an amendment which approves the projects for flood control and other purposes in the Columbia River Basin, including the Willamette River Basin, substantially in accordance with the plans recommended in the report of the Chief of Engineers dated June 28, 1949, and approved in the letter dated February 1, 1950, from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget for construction by the Corps of Engineers, both contained in House Document No. 531, Eighty-first Congress, these being the projects which are listed in the bill, and which authorizes to be appropriated the sum of \$75,000,000 for partial accomplishment of the listed projects and for continued prosecution of the previously approved plan for the Willamette Basin.

Amendment No. 107, Green-Duwamish River Basin: This amendment adopts a new project providing for a dam and reservoir in the Green River upstream from Seattle, Wash., for flood control. The estimated cost to the United States is \$16,300,000, and local interests are required to contribute \$2,000,000 to the cost of the project. The conferees feel that the project is needed to protect parts of the city of Seattle. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 108: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Merrimack and Connecticut Rivers and their tributaries, and such other streams in the States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Rhode Island, where power development appears feasible and practicable, to determine the hydroelectric potentialities, in combination with other water and resource development. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 109: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Israel River, at and in the vicinity of Lancaster, N. H., in the interest of flood control and related purposes. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 110: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Nanticoke River and tributaries, Maryland and Delaware, in the interest of flood control and major drainage improvements. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 111: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Mattaponi River, Va. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 112: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Perquimans River, N. C. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 113: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Filberts Creek at Edenton, N. C. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 114: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of streams on Johns Island and vicinity, South Carolina, in the interest of flood control and major drainage improvements. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 115: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Combahee River, Broad River, Black River, and

their tributaries, all in the State of South Carolina. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 116: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Satilla River, Ga.; Saint Marys River, Ga. and Fla.; Suwannee River, Ga. and Fla.; for flood control, navigation, and other beneficial uses. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 117: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Streams in Saint Johns, Flagler, and Putnam Counties, Fla., for flood control and major drainage improvements. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 118: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Manatee River, Fla. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 119: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of coastal streams flowing into the Gulf of Mexico between the Suwannee and Apalachicola Rivers, with a view to their improvement in the interest of flood control and related purposes. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 120: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Blackwater River, Fla. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 121: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Yellow River, Fla. and Ala. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 122: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Blackwater and Perdido Rivers, Ala. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 123: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Nine Mile Drain and Carlow Ditch, Macomb County, Mich. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 124: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Hatchie and Tusculum Rivers, Miss. and Tenn., in the interest of flood control and major drainage improvements. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 125: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey and study of alternate sites for the Millwood Reservoir, Ark., in the Red River Basin. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 126: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Dry Cimarron River, Union County, N. Mex., and Cimarron River, Okla., Colo., and Kans. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 127: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Salt River, Ky. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 128: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Lower Rio Grande Valley, including streams in Starr, Hidalgo, Cameron, and Willacy Counties, Tex., in the interest of flood control and major drainage improvements. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 129: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Buffalo Creek, Marion County, W. Va. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 130: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of waterway from Rangeline Lake to Oconto River, Wis., in the interest of flood control and major drainage improvements. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 131: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Milwaukee River and tributaries, Wisconsin. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 132: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Sacramento River, Calif., in the interest of bank protection and channel improvements below Red Bluff. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 133: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Walnut Creek drainage area, Contra Costa County, Calif. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 134: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Reclamation District No. 768, Humboldt County, Calif. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 135: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Mar-

tin Creek, at and in the vicinity of Paradise Valley, Humboldt County, Nev. House conferees concur.

Amendments Nos. 136 and 137: These amendments change the House provision authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of Gleason Creek, Robinson Watershed, in the vicinity of White Pine County, Nev., by providing that the survey shall apply to the section at and in the vicinity of Ely, Nev. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 138: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Samish River, Wash. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 139 (sec. 206): Provides that the dam site known as West Peterborough Dam in the Merrimack River Basin, authorized by the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936, and modified by the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, shall hereafter be known and designated as the Edward MacDowell Dam, and any law, regulation document, or record of the United States in which such dam is designated or referred to under the name of West Peterborough Dam shall be held to refer to such dam under and by the name of Edward MacDowell Dam. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 140 (sec. 207): Provides that funds hereafter appropriated for a specific and heretofore authorized project for a river, harbor, or flood-control works shall be merged with and be accounted for under the regular annual appropriation title applicable to such item. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 141 (sec. 208): Provides that section 204 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 is hereby amended by adding to the item therein for harbors and rivers in Alaska the following: "and that Federal investigations and improvements of rivers and other waterways in Alaska, for navigation, flood control, hydroelectric power, and allied purposes shall be continued under the jurisdiction of and shall be prosecuted by the Department of the Army under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers." House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 142 (sec. 209): Provides that the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army are directed to review their previous studies and to report to the Congress the amount of the total cost of the Alamogordo Dam and Reservoir on the Pecos River, N. Mex., which is properly allocable to flood control, in accordance with the provisions of section 7 of the Flood Control Act approved August 11, 1939. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 143: Provides for a change in section number. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 144: Provides for a change in section number. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 145: Provides for a change in section number. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 146: Provides for a change in section number. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 147: The effect of this amendment is to change the total amount authorized by the bill so as to conform to the action of the conferees. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 148: Provides that the sum of \$1,500,000 additional is authorized to be appropriated and expended by the Federal Power Commission for carrying out any examinations and surveys provided for in this act or any other acts of Congress, to be prosecuted by the Federal Power Commission. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 149: Provides for a change in section number. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 150: Provides for a change in section number. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 151 (sec. 216): Provides that section 7 of the Flood Control Act approved June 28, 1938, as amended by section 15 of the act approved December 22, 1944, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized in his discretion to undertake such emergency measures for run-off retardation and soil-erosion prevention as may be needed to safeguard lives and property from floods and the products of erosion on any watershed whenever fire or any other natural element or force has caused a sudden impairment of that watershed: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$300,000 out of any funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated for the prosecution by the Secretary of Agriculture of works of improvement or measures for run-off and waterflow retardation and soil-erosion prevention on watersheds may be expended during any one fiscal year for such emergency measures."

House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 152: Provides for a change in section number. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 153: Provides for a change in section number. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 154, Arkansas-White and Red River Basin Study Commission: The purpose of this amendment is to create a Commission to make studies and recommend a coordinated plan for conservation and development of the soil and water resources of the Arkansas-White and Red River Basins. It is the opinion of the conferees that such a study can be accomplished and the results coordinated with the appropriate Federal and State agencies under existing procedures of the Corps of Engineers as governed by law and administrative procedure. The conferees felt, therefore, that the purposes of amendment No. 154 can be adequately accomplished by adopting a substitute amendment and has inserted the substitute amendment in its proper place in the section of the bill dealing with such surveys. The purpose of the substitute amendment is to enable the Corps of Engineers to assemble all existing data and to perform such studies as necessary to prepare a comprehensive report for the basins included and to utilize the surveys and data available from other Federal agencies within their respective spheres of operations as defined by law, and in cooperation with State agencies.

Amendment No. 155, change in section number: This amendment provides for change in section number. House conferees recede from their disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment which provides for an additional change in section number necessitated by changes made by the conferees in prior sections.

Amendment No. 156, change of date: This provides for change in the date of title II from "1949" to "1950". House conferees concur.

WILL. M. WHITTINGTON,
HENRY D. LARCADE, Jr.,
CLIFFORD DAVIS,
GEO. A. DONDERO,
HOMER D. ANGELL,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report is unanimous. All amendments inserted by the Senate and agreed to by the House are described fully in the statement by the managers on the part of the House. All amendments adopted by the Senate and modified or amended by the conferees are described in detail in the conference report. Moreover the statement by the managers on the part of the House contains the name and the amount of the authorizations in the House bill together with a list of the items as agreed to in the conference for both rivers and harbors and flood control. There were reductions in most of the material in-

creases in the authorizations contained in the Senate amendments.

The statement by the Managers on the part of the House is very full, and contains the projects in the bill as it passed the House and the projects inserted by the Senate and approved by the conference with the estimated costs in both the river and harbor and flood control titles of the bill of all projects approved by the conference. All amendments inserted by the Senate are described in detail in the report.

The Senate devoted much time to the debate of the bill. Amendments were offered that would have materially increased the authorizations and would have changed existing laws with respect to reclamation projects in the Columbia River Basin, and after extensive debate the amendments were rejected by the Senate.

The Senate rejected substantially all amendments offered on the floor of the Senate after extensive debate. The bill as passed by the Senate, therefore, contains the amendments as reported by the Senate Committee on Public Works, and the Senate rejected, as stated, other material amendments offered on the floor. The Senate committee opposed amendments offered on the floor that had not been considered by that committee. It will be observed, therefore, that the bill as passed by the Senate rejected amendments that would have materially increased the authorizations and really changed existing laws. The Senate is to be commended for the course adopted in the passage of the bill. The Senate amendments are largely confined to the adoption of amendments authorizing projects transmitted to Congress by the Chief of Engineers after the bill passed the House and were carefully considered by the Senate Committee on Public Works.

The river and harbor amendments of the Senate on the Arkansas and the Ouachita Rivers were reduced by \$24,650,000. The largest project approved by the conferees for rivers and harbors is the Monongahela River in Pennsylvania and West Virginia, at an estimated cost of \$29,000,000. This is a large project, but if Congress is to continue to promote navigation the project is thoroughly justified. If Congress is to discontinue river and harbor improvements, the project for the Monongahela River should be rejected.

The Senate amended the flood-control authorization for the Ohio River by increasing it \$25,000,000. The authorization in the House bill would only have provided for substantially completing the projects under way. The conferees believed the \$25,000,000 to be justified.

In the Columbia River Basin, including the Willamette River Basin, the report with the favorable recommendations of the Chief of Engineers as approved by the budget was transmitted to Congress after the House reported the bill. It involves flood control and river and harbor projects in the Pacific Northwest aggregating approximately \$1,500,000,000. The Senate properly approved the report of the Chief of Engineers and authorized about \$142,000,000 for the partial accomplishment of the projects.

The conference agreed to reduce this amount to \$75,000,000. I believe the economy will be promoted by approving the conference report. There are bills pending in both the House and Senate for the establishment of Columbia Valley Administration. Such an administration would supplant the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation in the Columbia and Willamette River Basins. The adoption of the conference report contemplates that the river and harbor and flood-control projects in that basin shall continue to be planned and constructed by the Chief of Engineers, just as they are planned and constructed by the Chief of Engineers in all other river basins.

The pending bill is for authorizations. They are essential for general flood control after the appropriations are made as recommended by the Committee on Appropriations in the House, for the next fiscal year the remaining authorizations will be less than the amount appropriated for the current fiscal year for general flood control. If flood control is to continue, additional authorizations for general flood control must be made. The conference report contemplates authorizations for a period of 3 years. There have been no authorizations except for emergencies for flood control since 1946. If in the interest of economy it is necessary to reduce the annual appropriations that policy may be followed. On the other hand if widespread unemployment should obtain, the public interest would be promoted by having a shelf of approved projects that can be constructed not only for flood control, but at the same time to provide for unemployment. The conference report increases the authorizations for general flood control in the House bill by \$250,000,000, but this increase includes, among others, the increase in the basin authorization of \$25,000,000 along the Ohio River, and includes \$75,000,000 for the initiation of the projects along the Columbia and Willamette Rivers. The authorization for the Keystone Reservoir, while for \$37,000,000 more, will result in a saving of authorizations amounting to \$24,000,000, for this reservoir as agreed to by the conferees is to be substituted for three other reservoirs, the Mannford, the Blackburn, and the Taft Reservoirs along the Arkansas. In the State of Washington the Eagle Gorge Reservoir at an estimated cost of \$16,000,000 was included as a Senate amendment. It was transmitted in regular course and recommended by the Chief of Engineers. The report had not been transmitted to the House at the time the House bill was reported.

The Senate agreed to all of the projects in the House bill. On the other hand, the House approved the Senate amendments for projects where recommended by the Chief of Engineers in some cases with modifications, and reductions of the amounts authorized. The House conferees feel that the Senate conferees were most liberal in agreeing to take all House authorizations and in agreeing to modify in essential particulars so as to definitely show that the works in the Columbia River and Willamette River Basins as recommended

by the Chief of Engineers were approved, and that partial authorizations were made for their partial accomplishment as approved by the Director of the Budget.

I emphasize that the pending bill is the first comprehensive bill, including both river and harbor and flood-control authorizations agreed to by the conferees since 1946 except for emergencies in 1948, and I further emphasize that the total authorizations in the pending bill in the conference report are in reality smaller than the last general authorization for both rivers and harbors and flood control in 1946, 1945, and 1944.

While there were 156 amendments adopted by the Senate, the vast majority of these amendments embraced preliminary examinations and surveys for rivers and harbors and for flood control. Amendments 42 to 58, inclusive, embraced Senate amendments providing for 17 preliminary examinations and surveys for river-and-harbor projects.

Amendments 108 to 138, 31 in number, cover preliminary examinations and surveys for flood-control projects. The most important of these examinations covers the Merrimack and Connecticut Rivers and their tributaries and other streams in the States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Rhode Island. Provision was made for a comprehensive study of the Arkansas, White, and Red River Basins in the States of Oklahoma, Kansas, Colorado, New Mexico, Texas, Arkansas, Missouri, and Louisiana.

AUTHORIZATIONS FOR 3 YEARS

The authorizations in the bill as reported to the Senate amounted to \$1,564,814,825, and as passed by the Senate amounted to \$1,592,873,325, which includes \$30,179,000 for reclamation work on the Rio Grande, as against a total of \$1,117,586,175 as passed by the House. The total amount carried in the bill as agreed to in the conference is \$1,453,414,325, exclusive of \$30,179,000 for reclamation work on the Rio Grande, or there is a substantial reduction of the Senate amendments of \$109,280,000. The largest of these reductions are authorizations contained in Senate amendments for the Arkansas and Ouachita Rivers, for the Savannah River Basin, and for the Columbia River Basin including the Willamette River Basin. The authorizations will provide for construction for substantially 3 years.

APPROPRIATIONS

The total appropriations for the current fiscal year for rivers and harbors and flood control aggregated substantially \$684,000,000, and for the fiscal year 1951 as reported by the House Committee on Appropriations, they aggregate \$301,000,000.

COMPARISON WITH PREVIOUS AUTHORIZATIONS

The House will recall that the pending bill is the first major combined river-and-harbor and flood-control bill that has been considered since the reorganization of the Congress. A rather modest authorization was passed primarily for emergency projects in 1948 and the authorizations in the act of 1948 aggregated for both rivers and harbors and

flood control \$87,619,000, including \$30,444,000 for rivers and harbors and \$57,175,000 for flood control.

In 1946 the aggregate amount was \$1,387,395,070 adjusted to today's cost index with the aggregate of the two bills amounting to \$1,760,000,000, which is approximately \$372,000,000 in excess of the authorization of the pending bill as agreed to by the conferees.

The total authorizations in the Flood Control Act of 1944 and the River and Harbor Act of 1945 amounting to \$1,341,968,332 adjusted to today's cost index amounted to \$2,080,000,000 or about \$639,000,000 in excess of the authorizations in the pending bill as agreed to in the conference.

THE RIVER AND HARBOR ACT OF 1950—THE FLOOD CONTROL ACT OF 1950

Title I of the bill covers rivers and harbors, and as it passed the House it embraced 65 projects at an estimated cost of \$119,000,000. After the bill passed the House, additional reports with favorable recommendations by the Chief of Engineers were transmitted to Congress. The Senate approved the projects in the House bill and conducted hearings on the additional projects transmitted to Congress with favorable reports by the Chief of Engineers after the House bill was reported. By amendments, the Senate added 29 navigation projects recommended by the Chief of Engineers at an estimated cost of \$108,903,150. The conferees agreed to a reduction in the amounts authorized to be appropriated amounting to \$24,650,000, representing primarily reductions in authorizations for the Ouachita and Arkansas Rivers.

Title II of the bill covers flood control, and as it passed the House it carried authorizations for 22 new flood-control projects and for 18 modifications of authorized projects in the total amount of \$998,116,200. The Senate by amendments added 18 projects and modified or extended 6 projects in the total amount of \$366,384,000, which includes \$30,179,000 for reclamation work on the Rio Grande. The new flood-control projects added by the Senate were based upon reports transmitted to Congress with favorable recommendations by the Chief of Engineers since the House bill was reported. They were not considered by the House because they had not been transmitted to Congress.

The managers on the part of the House carefully considered all Senate amendments, and they agreed to the Senate amendments with reductions in the amounts authorized for flood control amounting to \$84,630,000, which are reductions in the Savannah River Basin and in the Columbia River Basin including the Willamette River Basin. There were other reductions, but these are the principal reductions. The comprehensive report on the Columbia River Basin had not been transmitted to Congress when the House reported the bill. It was transmitted to Congress before the bill was passed by the Senate. The bill approves the report of the Chief of Engineers as modified by the Director of the Budget but reduced the authorizations carried in the Senate bill for the initial

and partial construction of the projects to \$75,000,000 instead of \$142,000,000 as carried by the Senate amendments.

The Corps of Engineers has planned and executed river and harbor projects for the past 125 years. Many projects previously authorized are outmoded and will never be constructed. However, the total estimated costs of the balance of all river and harbor authorizations available up to the 25th of April 1950 were approximately \$2,051,616,000, or for authorizations for projects not under partial construction the difference between the said sum of \$2,051,616,000 and \$1,560,000,000, while on the other hand the total balance of authorizations available for general and Mississippi River flood control aggregates only about \$647,000,000. Additional authorizations especially for flood control are imperative. The conferees in making additional authorizations for rivers and harbors kept the balance of authorizations in mind, and for that reason the pending bill provides for vastly larger amounts of authorizations for flood-control projects than is provided for river and harbor projects.

The need at present is primarily additional authorizations for flood control to protect lives and property and to provide for the generation of much needed power especially in the Pacific northwest. The authorizations, therefore, for flood control as agreed to by the conferees are substantially six times as much as the authorizations for rivers and harbors. The managers on the part of the House believe that the bill as agreed to in conference will result in the passage by Congress of the most constructive river and harbor act and the most constructive flood-control act ever passed by the Congress.

The improvement of our national resources adds to the national wealth. Flood control and river and harbor improvements are valuable national assets. When Congress authorizes and appropriates for the improvement of our rivers and for the protection of our valleys, we are building America.

I cannot close without saying to the House that I have been a member of the Committee on Flood Control and of other important committees during the years, but I have never been a member of a committee whose membership was more industrious and faithful in attendance upon all hearings, and whose membership studied and considered more carefully all proposals submitted to them than the House Committee on Public Works.

I would like to make my acknowledgments to the former chairman of the committee and the present ranking minority member of that committee, my valued friend, GEORGE DONDERO. He has been indefatigable in his investigation of all proposals submitted to the committee, and his mature views have been most helpful. He has promoted through the years the national rather than the partisan view respecting the improvements of the national resources of the Nation. There is no more capable or faithful Member of the House of Representatives than my friend the gentleman

from Michigan, **GEORGE DONDERO**. He is a patriotic citizen and a most able Representative. I will always treasure my associations with all the members of the Committee on Public Works.

I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [**Mr. McCORMACK**], who desires to ask me a question.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman has answered my question about the New England survey about which I was going to inquire, which I appreciate very much.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I trust this report which in my judgment materially improves the bill as amended by the Senate will be approved by the House as the original bill was by a vote of 202 to 1, on August 22, 1949.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman knows of the terrible floods that are now raging in the Missouri Valley, and have been for the past couple of weeks, and the great problem that we have with floodwaters in the Missouri Valley.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I am aware of the problem and the floods mentioned.

Mr. JENSEN. Does the gentleman feel that the Missouri Valley has been treated properly in the way of flood-control authorization in this bill?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I do. One of the largest authorizations is for the Missouri River Basin. That was approved by the House without dissent. It was also approved by the Senate and it was agreed to in the conference.

I now yield to my colleague, the ranking member on the committee, the gentleman from Michigan [**Mr. DONDERO**], 7 minutes.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the kind and generous remarks made by our very able and distinguished chairman in regard to myself. My only hope is that I deserve what he said about me.

This House does not contain a Member who works harder, is a more thorough legislator, and a more brilliant Member of this body than our very able and distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [**Mr. WHITTINGTON**]. It is with keen personal regret that the news has come to me that he has chosen to withdraw voluntarily from the Congress of the United States. His district, his State, and our Nation will lose one of the ablest men in this body. I personally regret that he is leaving. I am sure he has the best wishes of all of us.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman made reference to the remarks made by the gentleman from Mississippi [**Mr. WHITTINGTON**] about the gentleman who now has the floor. The gentleman from Mississippi [**Mr. WHITTINGTON**] never says anything unless he firmly believes it.

Mr. DONDERO. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very large river and harbor and flood-control bill. For more than 17 years I have served on that committee, and have never come to this floor in opposition to a river and harbor or flood-control bill.

We passed the last bill in 1948, in the Eightieth Congress. When this bill went to the Senate some additions were made to it. If this bill did not cover an intended 3-year period, which makes 5 years in all, I think I would vote against it because of the amount. But when we divide the amount contained in this bill over a 3-year period it is not so large and is not out of line with previous legislation passed by this body for rivers and harbors and flood-control work. It is true the bill carries with it nearly a billion five hundred million in authorization, but I want to point out that when the bill passed the House last year \$785,000,000 of it was for increased authorization on projects already under construction, and some of them nearing completion. The total bill was \$1,100,000,000. That was necessary because of the increase in the cost of constructing this kind of work in the United States. When that amount is deducted, even with the additions made by the Senate, this bill is not out of line with other legislation which this Congress has passed for river and harbor and flood-control work of the Nation.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I have noticed in the tables that have been presented by the engineers very large increases resulting from changes in plans and increased plans for certain projects. Frankly, that has disturbed me. When bills have come before the Appropriations Committee for the purpose of providing funds to continue projects the result has been that the sponsors would come in to get their initial appropriation of a small amount and then come back for a large amount the next year. It has been very disturbing to those of us who have tried to keep things at all within bounds.

Mr. DONDERO. I realize the force of what the gentleman says. I, too, have had my differences with the Army Engineers on the question of increasing authorizations; but I recognize, and I think everybody else does, that within the last few years the costs of all construction work have increased very materially.

Mr. TABER. But these estimates have gone up way beyond what increases in cost would justify, and have been the result of large additions to the projects which were not disclosed to the Congress at the time the initial appropriations were made. That policy should not be continued.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. While I appreciate the force of the statement, the fact remains that practically all, and certainly all of the major works, are let on competitive bids. Regardless of the amount authorized or appropriated, the country gets the benefit of those competitive bids in the amount of the award.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. RICH. The bill as it comes back to us lists many projects not contained in the bill at the time I left the House. Does the gentleman feel that at this particular time we should add over \$400,000,000 to the bill, which is the effect of the increases?

Mr. DONDERO. I think I know what the gentleman alludes to. I would not have included them if I had my say about it, or if it were left to my decision. They were included in the other body. They are mostly in the Pacific Northwest. No doubt that region, because of its rapid increase in population, needs more river and harbor flood-control work, and power dams. However, the conferees of the House did obtain a substantial reduction of \$85,000,000 in the flood-control amount included in the bill by the Senate. No items were deducted from the House bill; they were deducted from the Senate projects.

Mr. RICH. Does the bill now carry new projects in addition to what were contained in the bill at the time it passed the House?

Mr. DONDERO. Yes; it includes the larger amount that was put in by the Senate for projects in the northwestern part of the United States.

Mr. RICH. Is the other body figuring on building these great power projects with the idea of socializing the Northwest? The Southwest?

Mr. DONDERO. This House and the committee know my stand on that question. I do not object to the Federal Government's producing the power; what I do object to is the Federal Government's going into the retail business of power and thereby coming into competition with private enterprise.

Mr. RICH. They not only furnish the power on a lot of these projects, but they build transmission lines that compete with private enterprise. The trouble is that eventually they will want to take over distribution to the consumer, socializing our country.

Mr. DONDERO. I agree with the gentleman. I have always opposed that policy.

Mr. RICH. We ought to oppose it. We do not want anybody to get the idea that we are for socialization. The Congress is supporting Great Britain now, a Socialist country. We want to stop this socialization and aid to socialism.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, regretfully, I must decline to yield further; there are other matters to which I wish to address myself.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a correction.

Mr. DONDERO. Certainly.

Mr. LARCADE. If the gentleman will refer to the tabulation he will find that the House conferees were responsible for reducing the Senate projects by \$109,280,000, rather than \$85,000,000.

Mr. DONDERO. I had reference to the flood-control section. You are correct; the total reduction in the bill is \$109,280,000.

One thing more to which I wish to call attention: I asked the Army engineers

to make a tabulation of all the authorized projects now on the shelf. The total they gave me is \$2,160,000,000. When this amount is added to this bill we will have about three and one-half billion dollars. Since that amount is spread over an average period of 5 years you can see it is not far out of line with the amount we are appropriating each year for the continuation and construction of this work. We are now appropriating approximately \$600,000,000 annually for this work.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The fact of the matter is that many of the projects have been adopted years and years ago, many of them will not be constructed because they are outmoded at the present time.

Mr. DONDERO. That is correct.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Will the gentleman inform us in dollars how much was added to the bill by the Senate?

Mr. DONDERO. The amount in dollars added by the Senate for river and harbor work was \$108,903,000, and the amount added in the Senate for flood-control work was \$366,384,000.

Mr. KEATING. So that almost one-half billion of the billion and a half involved in the bill has been added by the Senate?

Mr. DONDERO. That is correct.

Mr. KEATING. When we had the bill here before it was approximately one billion?

Mr. DONDERO. That is right. The other body put in projects that were not ready for report to the House committee at the time the bill was before the House last year. They were reported to the Senate this year.

Mr. KEATING. I feel sure the gentleman shares my view, knowing his general feeling, that there are times such as the present when we might have to curtail on projects, that we might put them through at a different time and in a different state of the Federal Treasury.

Mr. DONDERO. Yes. The remedy for that is to withhold appropriations.

Mr. KEATING. The pressure is greater for them once they have been approved.

Mr. DONDERO. I have learned something about pressure in the years I have been here.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to correct a statement made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]. The Federal Government does not engage in the retail sale of electricity. Where this power is owned by the Federal Government it does build transmission lines and sells at wholesale. It does not retail the power.

Mr. DONDERO. I am willing to debate that question with the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. I want to ask the gentleman one question. In connection with these items placed in the bill in the Senate were there budget estimates for those items?

Mr. DONDERO. I understand there were budget estimates, and we were so informed in conference.

Mr. RABAUT. None were put in on the floor over there?

Mr. DONDERO. That is my understanding. Perhaps the chairman can explain that.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman has made a correct statement. If I may be permitted to say in response to the question, the bill as agreed to in conference accomplishes the very thing that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] is undertaking to bring to our attention. We only approved works to be constructed by the Corps of Engineers in the Pacific Northwest just as they have been constructed everywhere else. We are not departing from that and permitting any other agency to construct them. There are no authorizations for transmission lines.

Mr. RABAUT. I want to ask this further question: Are the projects that have been placed in this bill in the Senate there with a budget estimate?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. They are substantially with budget approval just as projects in the House bill were generally with budget approval.

Mr. RABAUT. Why does the gentleman say "substantially?"

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I use the word as the equivalent of immaterial, minor, or small. That is what I mean. In some cases, Congress does not agree with the Director of the Budget. But the big projects like the Columbia River Basin are in here with the approval of the budget and it is specifically stated in the conference report that in approving that project we approve it as recommended by the Chief of Engineers and upon the approval of the Director of the Budget.

Mr. RABAUT. I may say to the gentleman that some of these things that are immaterial in the Senate appear quite gigantic in the House.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. We understand that, and for that reason we are asking for partial authorization. And, I will say further that one of the largest items included in this conference report was recommended since the bill passed the House, and that is the \$29,000,000 for navigation along the Monongahela River, on which river there is more navigation today than any other river of its size in the world.

I thank my colleague for yielding to me to make that statement.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. As the gentleman has stated, the Senate increased the amount about \$500,000,000.

Mr. DONDERO. Yes.

Mr. FORD. The House was the saving influence, so to speak. Would anything be gained by returning this conference report to conference in an effort to cut the added amounts put on by the other body?

Mr. DONDERO. I do not think so.

Mr. FORD. In other words, the gentleman feels that they would not recede if we should return the conference report.

Mr. DONDERO. No. We struggled with this matter for 2 days before we came to an agreement.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Is it not true that the items put in by the other body and agreed to by the conferees in most instances take care of projects where there were worn-out locks, worn-out dams, and also construction partially completed?

Mr. DONDERO. Only some of the projects.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. And failure to support in the main what was put in by the other body would result in loss rather than a saving over a long period.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman is correct.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, one of the joys and pleasures of my 22 years of service in this body has been, and is today, by association with the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, WILL WHITTINGTON. We are all sorry to hear that our distinguished friend and colleague is not going to seek reelection. We know the confidence that the people of his district have in him, and that if he sought reelection, that he would be renominated and reelected without opposition.

When I first came here 22 years ago one of the first Members that I met was the gentleman from Mississippi, WILL WHITTINGTON. During my 22 years as a Member of this body a very close friendship has developed. I know of no Member during my period of service that has had more potent influence in the House than WILL WHITTINGTON; a man of unusual ability, a man of devotion to service, a man of loyalty to those great fundamental truths that he believes in. He has left his imprint in the Halls of Congress.

Today we are considering the final stage of the rivers and harbors bill, which will be the last rivers and harbors bill that our distinguished friend will sponsor as a Member of the House of Representatives, a bill in which he adopts the role of leadership in its passage through the Congress of the United

States. Many rivers and harbors bills have passed under his leadership. The one we are now considering is a great tribute, as will be evidenced by the unanimity by which it will be adopted, and shows the confidence that the House has in WILL WHITTINGTON, and the respect that we have for him and for his leadership. As majority leader for about 8 years I want to in that capacity express the deep gratitude that I have for WILL WHITTINGTON in the ever loyal way in which he has supported my leadership. I know in that statement I express the sentiment of Speaker RAYBURN.

Speaking for all of our colleagues without regard to party, and I think I can do so without anyone taking issue, everyone who ever served with WILL WHITTINGTON has the highest respect for him and a complete feeling of confidence in him. If ever a man has impressed me with his intellectual honesty it has been WILL WHITTINGTON. His ability I have referred to, and his integrity is above reproach.

Above all, the trait in him that I have admired is his loyalty, his loyalty to his spiritual beliefs, his loyalty to his country, his loyalty to the House, his loyalty to his committee, his loyalty to his party, his loyalty to his leadership, his loyalty to his friends, and his loyalty to his constituents.

I regret very much that he is not coming back to the House because the country needs the services of a man like WILL WHITTINGTON at all times, but particularly in a period of stress and troubles such as we are undergoing today.

I take these few minutes to pay tribute to a great legislator, a great American, and a great man, the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.].

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to report to the House the death of my constituent, a former illustrious Member of this House from 1906 to 1920, the Honorable J. Hampton Moore.

"Hammy," as he was so affectionately well known, had a long and honorable career in public service. He was one of the most active and energetic men it has been my privilege to know. His background was unusual; it spelled "activity" always. He was a reporter on the old Public Ledger in Philadelphia—probably his greatest story having been a report on the Johnstown flood; he was a court reporter, chief clerk to the city treasurer, secretary to a mayor, city treasurer, first Chief Clerk of the Bureau of Manufactures of the Department of Commerce and Labor, and president of a Philadelphia trust company. He will also be remembered for his long service as president of the Atlantic Deeper Waterways Association.

Mr. Moore will be remembered by many of our colleagues as an active member of the Ways and Means Committee and an outstanding leader in the councils of the Republican Party when

that party was in control of Congress and the national administration. He left Congress to serve as mayor of Philadelphia, in which capacity he served two terms with great distinction.

Philadelphia and the Nation have lost an outstanding citizen, a patriotic American, and a noted public servant. We mourn his passing; he will never be forgotten.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the appropriation bill is pending, as the Members realize, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks on this rivers, harbors, and flood-control bill at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to speak in behalf of the Green-Duwamish River flood-control project, which is situated in my congressional district. The Green River rises in the Cascades at an elevation of approximately 5,000 feet and flows in a northwesterly direction for about 60 or 70 miles, where it empties into the Puget Sound at Seattle, Wash. The flood plain begins just above the city of Auburn, which has a population of approximately 6,000. The river flows through a fertile valley, which is about 2 or 3 miles in width. The river joins with the Black River, and from the junction to the sound, about 12 miles away, the river is known then as the Duwamish River. The property on the lower Duwamish is prospective industrial-site property for the city of Seattle.

The two most recent and disastrous floods occurred in 1933 and 1946 inundating approximately 13,000 acres and 12,000 acres, respectively. The estimated damages from the 1933 and 1946 floods are estimated at about \$1,750,000 and \$1,350,000, respectively, on the basis of 1947 prices. These damages include both damage to valuable agricultural and to urban areas, floodwaters actually coming into the city of Kent. Just recently we had another flood which, although not as severe as the other two, did considerable damage. There is always the danger of another.

This proposed project has been carefully surveyed and approved by the district and division engineers of the United States Army, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and the Chief of Engineers. It also has the approval of the Bureau of the Budget. The total estimated cost of the dam is \$18,300,000, of which \$2,000,000 will be contributed by the State and local governments. The 1949 Legislature of the State of Washington has appropriated \$1,500,000, to be made available when the project is authorized by Congress and funds appropriated. The Board of King County Commissioners has set aside \$500,000, to be made available as soon as the project is authorized. I am in receipt of a telegram from the board of county commissioners, which reads as follows:

County and State are ready financially to proceed with Eagle Gorge Dam work. Urgent

need that this project receive all possible attention.

Without question, Mr. Speaker, the dam is urgently needed.

The estimated benefits are \$893,000 annually and include abatement of floods, pollution control, and benefit to fish life. More particularly, this item is broken down in the following manner: \$429,000 from benefits of tangible flood damage; \$214,000 from increased return from protected agricultural lands; \$191,000 from increased returns from industrial lands; \$59,000 from benefit to fish life.

The annual carrying charge is estimated at \$823,139. With \$2,000,000 of the cost being borne by the State and county, the total carrying charges would be \$831,628, due to the interest rate of 3.5 percent applied to non-Federal cost. Maintenance and operation are estimated at \$80,000 annually.

I urge favorable action upon this project, which is of tremendous concern and importance to the people in the area affected.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the members of the conference committee, both on the House and Senate side, for their agreement on the full \$3,000,000 authorization for the completion of the plan approved in the Flood Control Act of June 30, 1948, for the Red River of the North Basin.

We have recently had a tremendous amount of flood damage both in Minnesota and North Dakota in the Red River of the North drainage basin and it is now more necessary than ever to expedite the surveys and develop the various projects which are included in the comprehensive plan so that these damaging floods will not recur each spring.

I certainly will support this conference report as I believe projects of this kind benefit the people of the area and in the long run return dividends to the United States Treasury.

I am of course happy that the bill includes my own suggested legislation calling for an examination and survey for flood control and allied purposes, including final and major drainage improvements under the direction of the Corps of Engineers for the following streams in northwestern Minnesota: Mud River, Thief River, Moose River, Lost River, Snake River, Tamarac River, Two River, Big Joe River, and Little Joe River, tributaries of the Red River of the North.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, this is the time of year when the columnist and commentator declare open season on the omnibus river and harbor and flood-control bill by declaring it a pork-barrel measure. The inference is that most of the projects in the bill are there not because they do anyone any good except the Congress.

Not all and, I believe, very few of the projects in the bill are what can be called pork.

Let us examine a project in my own district as to whether it is a pork barrel or a worthy, needed undertaking.

The project to which I refer calls for the expenditure of \$16,000,000 to provide flood protection for the lower side of the Columbia River and to protect

some 8 miles of river bank from being eroded.

Now, \$16,000,000 is, I suspect, a large sum of money. However, the floods in this area of 2 years ago cost property damage estimated by the Army engineers at \$104,000,000 and 50 lives. The \$16,000,000 that this bill carried for flood-protection measures in this area will prevent the possibility of a repetition of this disaster.

If we do not build these \$16,000,000 of dikes, we may save that money, but, if a flood comes, we may suffer the loss of another \$104,000,000 of property. The spending of \$16,000,000 on these dikes, it seems to me, is good insurance and in the long run is less expensive than taking the chance of suffering the danger and damage of another great flood.

In short, we will pay for these dikes whether we build them or not. If we build them, we will be spending \$16,000,000, but if we do not build them, we may lose \$104,000,000 as the result of flood damage.

The total amount carried as estimates on the cost of projects in this bill are approximately \$1,600,000,000. Many will think Congress is spending that much money on river and harbor projects at this one time.

That is not the case. The projects authorized in this bill will not be constructed in any one year. Their construction will extend over several years or many years.

This is not an appropriation bill. It does not appropriate funds for any project. It merely states in effect that the projects in this bill are, in the opinion of the committees and of Congress, worthy to be constructed at some future time.

The Appropriations Committee later will determine which of these projects shall be started and when, and how many years it will require to complete any project in this bill.

Some of these projects will be started next year, no doubt, these being of an emergency nature. Others of the projects in this bill may not be undertaken for years.

This bill merely places the projects in it on the advance planning board for use when the Government has the available funds to undertake their construction.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, in reference to the discussion which was had between me and the gentleman from Mississippi relative to building these transmission lines and getting into socialism I want the gentleman from Mississippi to know that I know he is one of the advocates of power and while I would like to see a lot of power and cheap power I want to see more power in the House of Representatives to stay away from socialism. If you will use your energy to keep this country out of socialism as much as you are to try to get power you will be doing this country a great service. I want to say to the gentleman from Mississippi that in the Southwest you are distributing power from these transmission lines through these cooperatives and these cooperatives are not paying any taxes to

the Government. If that is not socialism or the next thing to it, why, then I do not know anything about socialism. What we have to do is to stop it. I want you to help to stop it. That is what I want to impress on you right now. The Members of Congress should remember that we have about \$11,000,000,000 of work now in progress on rivers and harbors and \$13,000,000,000 worth of flood-control work approved by Congress. This bill has been approved by the Congress. You have the Army engineers trying to help this country getting these flood-control projects ready. They have \$20,000,000,000 worth of work on the drafting boards approved by the Army engineers. That is a total of \$44,000,000,000. You cannot do this work all at one time. It must be distributed over a period of years. Years, I say, many years. Nobody knows that better than the gentleman from Mississippi, or we go broke. Yes, bankrupt. Be wise and economize.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman is just mistaken to the extent of about \$40,000,000,000, that is all.

Mr. RICH. Forty-four billion dollars, and forty-four billion dollars to me is a whale of a lot of money but to some people it does not seem to be too much. You must stop going in the red.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROOSEVELT], and at the same time wish to state that there is nothing about power transmission in this bill.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday President Truman submitted to the Senate for its ratification, a treaty between the United States and Canada covering the uses of the waters of the Niagara River. To implement this treaty, Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN and I are today jointly introducing the Niagara Redevelopment Act of 1950. The first objective of the treaty, and our joint proposal, is to maintain Niagara Falls as a majestic American scenic spectacle. For generations the Falls have been a symbol for the whole Nation of the lavishness with which God endowed our country. It is estimated that about 1,000,000 people visit Niagara Falls each year; that is tribute enough to how much the Falls mean to Americans.

For some years, however, the scenic grandeur of Niagara has been imperiled. Uncontrolled erosion and uneven pressure of the turbulent waters has seriously threatened the crestline of the Falls. The treaty submitted by the President yesterday was negotiated primarily to fix permanently the spectacular grandeur that is Niagara Falls. Provision is made in the treaty for restoration of the Falls where erosion has damaged the crestline, so that the slow transformation of the Falls into a mere cascade can be stopped. Specific arrangements are provided in the treaty for guaranteeing the minimum amount of water that will roar over the Falls, and for building works to remedy the damage that is being done to the Falls.

If the sole consequence of this treaty, and our implementing bill, was to preserve the Niagara as an historic Amer-

ican institution, they would certainly be worthwhile. But far more is involved. As a result of the division of the water resources, we will have a greater opportunity to expand prodigiously the electric energy available in New York and the States which surround it. So much power potential exists in the Niagara that it staggers the imagination. Generation of 1,330,000 kilowatts of electrical power will be made possible on the United States side alone. Every year, the Niagara—if properly redeveloped—can yield 7,900,000 kilowatt-hours of new electrical energy. In magnitude, the Niagara power development proposed here would rank second only to the Grand Coulee in power generation capacity, and would just about equal it in the energy produced.

Such a vast increase in available electrical energy will naturally be of great concern to many interested parties. The interests of these parties must be reconciled so that the greatest public benefit results. In the State of New York alone, there are 3,800,000 consumers of residential electric service, 667,000 commercial users, and 22,000 industrial clients. All of these—and their neighbors across the State lines—will be affected by how much power is generated, how it is distributed, by whom, and how much it costs. A review of the section-by-section analysis of the bill will indicate how we propose to protect the legitimate interest of the various governments involved—and above all, of the people to whom this great resource belongs.

It is unthinkable that a development of public resources of this size should be made for the primary benefit of any profit-making individuals or groups. Yet there is not, at the moment, any public body authorized to develop the project. As of now, the Federal Power Commission is the only public agency with authority to grant licenses to private individuals or groups.

The bill which I am introducing puts the whole development question squarely up to the government of the State of New York. If New York cannot come to an appropriate agreement with the Federal Government for public development of the Niagara, then the Federal Government will act. In fact, the bill goes a little further than that. It authorizes the Corps of Engineers to begin construction at the Falls, even before the State of New York acts. The State of New York may then signify its willingness to assume responsibility for its operation, with guaranties for the rights of others.

Public development of the power at Niagara will mean the accomplishment of a goal that has been a New York State tradition since the beginning of this century. Again and again, the State's leaders—Democrats and Republicans alike—have called for public development. Here are some typical expressions of opinion.

Charles Evans Hughes, Governor of New York, 1907-10:

It is well to consider the great value of the undeveloped water powers * * * under State control. They should be preserved and held for the benefit of all the people and should not be surrendered to private interests. It would be difficult to exaggerate the

advantages which may ultimately accrue from these great resources of power if the common right is duly safeguarded. (Annual message to the legislature, January 2, 1907.)

These great natural sources of power should not only be developed in a manner which the State alone can make possible, but should be held for the benefit of the people under conditions which will insure the protection of the common right and fair return for privileges granted. (Annual message to the legislature, January 6, 1909.)

Theodore Roosevelt, Governor of New York, 1899-1900:

You have in this section a most valuable asset in your natural water power. You have elected too many men in the past who have taken what belongs to the Nation. Coal and oil barons cannot compare to water-power barons. Do not let them get a monopoly on what belongs to this State. * * * Do not give up your water power for a promise of quick development. We are poor citizens if we allow the things worth most to get into the hands of a few. (Address at Watertown, N. Y., October 10, 1914.)

Alfred E. Smith, Governor of New York, 1919-20; 1923-28:

"The cost of energy developed from falling water is determined very largely by the cost of the capital employed in the development. A public corporation such as you propose, whose securities would be exempt from taxation under the Federal law and the State law, should produce, if properly set up, the required money substantially cheaper than a private corporation could obtain it."

The authority for this statement also made the following statement:

"I see no objection, but on the contrary, I can see some advantages, to the development of the great water powers on the St. Lawrence and in the gorge of the Niagara by a public corporation rather than by a private corporation, and to the ownership of all lands, water rights, flowage, dams, powerhouses, and structures by such a public corporation."

The author of the statement above is Owen D. Young, chairman of the board of directors of the General Electric Co. * * *

There is only one issue at stake and it is this: Shall the State of New York, through a corporation of its own creation develop these great water-power resources for the benefit of all the people of the State or shall it give a license for a long term of years to a private corporation to develop for their own purposes? * * *

Such a public corporation is just as capable of carrying on the developments as a private one. It can hire the same brains and engineering ability that a private corporation can hire. It can float its securities against the earning power of the development a great deal cheaper than the private company can. Nothing stands in its way but the desire of a small group of men, powerful and influential, to retain for themselves and the private interests that they represent, the right to own and control these great water-power resources. * * * (The) legislature should adhere to a policy long ago suggested and once adopted, to develop these water powers by the State itself for the benefit of all the people as against private development for the benefit of the few. (Public statement, Albany, February 27, 1926.)

Franklin D. Roosevelt, Governor of New York, 1929-32:

In the brief time that I have been speaking to you, there has run to waste on their paths toward the sea, enough power from our rivers to have turned the wheels of a thousand factories, to have lit a million farmers' homes—power which nature has supplied us through the gift of God. It is intolerable that the utilization of this stupendous heritage should be longer delayed by petty squabbles and partisan dispute. Time will not

solve the problem; it will be more difficult as time goes on to reach a fair conclusion. It must be solved now.

I should like to state clearly the outstanding features of the problem itself. First, it is agreed, I think, that the waterpower of the State should belong to all the people. There was, perhaps, some excuse for careless legislative gift of power sites in the days when it was of no seemingly great importance. There can be no such excuse now. The title to this power must vest forever in the people of this State. No commission, no, not the legislature itself has any right to give, for any consideration whatever, a single potential kilowatt in virtual perpetuity to any person or corporation whatsoever. The legislature in this matter is but the trustee of the people, and it is their solemn duty to administer such heritage so as most greatly to benefit the whole people. On this point there can be no dispute. (Inaugural address, Albany, January 1, 1929.)

HERBERT H. LEHMAN, Governor of New York, 1933-42:

And this brings me to speak of another great power resource the State possesses in the falls of the Niagara River. There the potentialities are comparable to those of the St. Lawrence. I hope to see a public development of the latent power resources of Niagara so that the people of the State, whether in New York City, Buffalo, Binghamton, Albany, or on the farms, may participate in its benefits as well as those of the St. Lawrence.

Both of these great water powers belong to the people of the State and must be protected. I have on two former occasions recommended a constitutional amendment, designed to write into the State constitution the safeguard that the water-power resources owned by the State shall forever remain inalienable for the use of the people and not of private utility companies. I again recommend the adoption of this amendment to the constitution. (Special message to the legislature, January 14, 1941.)

Thomas E. Dewey, Governor of New York since 1943:

I have always strongly advocated the development of the power resources of the State by government, for the benefit of all the people and not for any private monopoly. (Public statement, Watertown, October 10, 1942.)

There are many, many more similar statements on the record. They leave no doubt about the long-standing almost universal commitment in New York State to public development. Public development will be practical as well as principled. With the credit of the people of New York State behind them, the interest charges on money for construction—a major factor in hydroelectric costs—will be practically cut in half. If the State of New York takes these works over—and I sincerely hope they do—they can finance the cost through private investment channels, and reimburse the Federal Government for any outlay. Should the State fail to exercise option we propose Congress to extend it; then it seems to me that Congress itself should set up an instrumentality to permit the Treasury to be reimbursed for the capital outlay by refinancing through private channels.

Right at the outset, I want to warn against the possible misrepresentations of this proposal by selfish, vested interests. We are not advocating nationalization of the electric power industry. Neither the Federal nor the State Gov-

ernments are in the business of retailing electricity. I am not advocating that they go into that business. What I am advocating is that the State or Federal Government be permitted to develop this great natural resource for the benefit of the people—all of them—to whom it belongs. The power produced can then be sold wholesale, with transmission to the load centers, to private companies, provided that preference goes to municipalities and nonprofit cooperatives. This is being done in many other parts of the country, and is completely consistent with our country's long-established power policy.

The enactment of this bill will be the first step in meeting a power deficiency in New York and the adjacent States. This deficiency caused grave concern during the war to our military and war-production leadership. Just a few days ago, continuing concern was expressed by the Secretary of the Army, Frank Pace, Jr., about this situation, before the House Committee on Public Works.

There is a great advantage—

Said the Secretary of the Army—

in having for national-defense purposes the large source of cheap, dependable power which would result if the project were completed. Specifically, it would be of material benefit in the production of strategically important aluminum.

He was testifying on the St. Lawrence River proposal, but his words obviously apply with equal force to the Niagara.

Just as this deficiency is inexcusable with respect to our national defense, it is inexcusable with respect to our economy. New York, and the region of which it is a part, have not kept pace with the expansion of power achieved by the rest of the country since 1920. Using 1900 as the base year (index 100), the Federal Power Commission reports that the national production of energy had gone to 717.4 by 1948. The New England States had gone to only 550.6; the Middle Atlantic States to only 585; New York lags in having reached an index rating of only 482.3.

Every responsible expert body has expressed complete confidence that the new energy created at the Niagara could be absorbed by the area in very short order. This has been generally true throughout the country. The late Senator George Norris is quoted as having said:

Wherever in this world an abundance of low-cost power has been developed, its very existence has immediately created a shortage.

The additional energy from Niagara would be absorbed by the farms, factories, and homes as a blotter absorbs ink. In 1948, New York was near the bottom of the list of States in the average amount of residential electricity used by its homes. The Empire State ranked forty-first in the list of States. It ranked forty-second in terms of the average cost of residential electricity; only six States had higher rates for home users. Public development of the Niagara would expand the power available, and would almost surely cut the costs to business, home, and farm users substantially.

It is impossible to forecast exactly what the rate reductions and average use expansions would be. But the Province of

Ontario right across the river offers some point of comparison, since there has been considerable public development of hydroelectric power. If we in New York had been paying the Ontario rates, we would have saved in 1948 alone, \$317,889,538. About \$112,000,000 of this saving would have gone to home users, about \$51,000,000 to industrial users, and about \$153,000,000 to commercial users.

Every home, business, farm, factory, and labor union has a dollars-and-cents interest in these figures and in the prospect of achieving savings like them. Expanded markets for consumer goods of many kinds would be created. The job of finally completing the electrification of our farms—more than 90 percent done—will be eased. Every day that we needlessly lose these great benefits, every day that we see them fall into the great gorge at the Niagara—damaging the falls in the process, must be a day of bitterness to those concerned with the fruitful use of our national abundance.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] such time as he desires.

(Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, as one of the conferees on the part of the House on this conference report, I want to express my approval of the statement made by the chairman of our committee, Mr. WHITTINGTON, and the ranking Republican member of the committee, Mr. DONDERO. First let me join with Mr. DONDERO in commending the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Mississippi, for the outstanding public service he has performed for the Nation down through the years as a Member of the House of Representatives. I join with my colleague, Mr. DONDERO, in stating that no Member of the House during my service here has been more diligent in his duties, more efficient in his work, and more considerate of the members of the committee over which he presides than has the gentleman from Mississippi. I am sure that every Member of the House has a deep feeling of regret that his service in the Congress will be terminated at the end of the Eighty-first Congress and that he is voluntarily retiring from public service. It will be a great loss to his district, to the State, and to the Nation.

The conferees of the House and Senate, as has been said, devoted much time to the consideration of the amendments to H. R. 5472 which were added in the Senate. After long conferences, the unanimous agreement was reached in which material savings in monetary authorizations were effected by reason of the insistence on the part of the House conferees that cuts in some of the authorizations be made. However, I feel certain that no great injury will be done to projects where the full amount was not allowed. My own projects in Oregon shared with other parts of the country in taking cuts in these authorizations. It should be remembered, of course, that this is an authorization bill and no part of the authorization in the bill can be expended until Congress by appropriations passes upon each individual proj-

ect. It should be said also that the conferees followed a uniform rule to withhold approval of any project that had not been approved by the Corps of Army Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget, with one or two exceptions where special circumstances justified such approval. A major portion covers increases in existing appropriations or authorizations. It should also be pointed out that while this bill in the aggregate authorizes a large appropriation, nearly a billion and one-half dollars, it covers a long-range program extending for 3 years or more in the monetary appropriations allowed and also covers at least 2 years in the past for which authorizations have been provided. As a result, it covers 5 years in monetary authorizations, and the total amount allowed is not disproportionate to the annual appropriations that have been made in the past for the combined projects under rivers and harbors and flood control.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill, H. R. 5472, recommended:

Title I of the bill, rivers and harbors, as it passed the House carried authorizations for 65 projects in the amount of \$119,469,975. The Senate by amendments added 29 navigation projects costing \$108,903,150, making a grand total of \$228,373,125 for rivers and harbors. The navigation projects added by the Senate were based on reports which were recommended by the Chief of Engineers but were not submitted to Congress in time for consideration by the House committee, as shown by the Senate hearings, before the bill was reported to the House. The conferees feel that they should now be included, since they have been submitted to Congress and heard and considered by the Senate committee.

Title II of the bill, flood control, as it passed the House carried authorizations for 22 new flood-control projects

and for 18 modifications of authorized projects in a total amount of \$998,116,200. The Senate, by amendments, added 18 projects and modified or extended 6 projects contained in the House bill in a total amount of \$366,384,000, which includes \$30,179,000 for reclamation work on the Rio Grande, making a grand total of \$1,334,321,200 for flood control. The new flood-control projects added by the Senate were, as in title I, based on reports which were recommended by the Chief of Engineers, but were not submitted to Congress in time for consideration by the House committee, as shown by the Senate hearings, before the bill was reported to the House. As in connection with title I the conferees agree that these new projects should now be included since they have been submitted to Congress and heard and considered by the Senate committee.

The results of the conference are as follows:

For rivers and harbors the total additional amounts of \$108,903,150, as passed by the Senate, were reduced by agreement among the conferees by \$24,650,000, representing reductions in authorizations for the Ouachita and Arkansas Rivers. The total additional amount for rivers and harbors, therefore, included by the Senate and agreed to in conference, is \$84,253,150.

With respect to flood control, the total additional amounts added by the Senate of \$366,384,000 of which \$30,179,000 is for work to be prosecuted by the Bureau of Reclamation were reduced by \$84,630,000, representing reductions in authorizations for the Savannah River Basin and the Columbia River Basin including the Willamette River Basin. The total additional amount, therefore, added by the Senate and agreed to in conference, for flood control, is \$251,575,000.

The totals in the bill as recommended by the conferees covering titles I and II only with the reductions effected by the conferees are as follows:

Action of conferees on H. R. 5472

RIVERS AND HARBORS—TITLE I

Total as passed by House.....	\$119,469,975	
Added by Senate.....	108,903,150	
Total House and Senate.....		\$228,373,125
Reductions made by conferees:		
Ouachita River (from \$36,950,000 to \$21,300,000).....	\$15,650,000	
Arkansas River (from \$89,000,000 to \$80,000,000).....	9,000,000	
		24,650,000
Total river and harbor as reported from conference.....		203,723,125

FLOOD CONTROL—TITLE II

Total as passed by House.....	\$998,116,200	
Added by Senate (includes \$30,179,000 for reclamation work on Rio Grande).....	366,384,000	
Total House and Senate.....		1,364,500,200
Reductions made by conferees:		
Hartwell Reservoir (from \$68,377,000 to \$50,000,000).....	\$18,377,000	
Columbia River Basin (following items added by Senate were deleted by conferees):		
Modification of Fern Ridge Dam, Oreg.....	\$133,000	
Willamette River supplemental levees and overflow channel enclosures (no effect on monetary authorizations).....	0	
Hepner Dam and downstream channel improvements, Willow Creek, Oreg.....	3,771,000	
Harbors at 21 locations, Oregon, Washington, Idaho.....	2,300,000	
Local flood protection projects reduced from \$28,000,000 to \$15,000,000.....	13,000,000	
Reduction in general authorization.....	47,049,000	
Total reductions in Columbia River Basin (\$141,253,000 to \$75,000,000).....	66,253,000	
Total reductions by conferees.....		84,630,000
Total flood control as reported from conference (includes \$30,179,000 for reclamation work on Rio Grande).....		1,279,870,200
Total title I and title II.....		1,483,593,325
Total excluding \$30,179,000 for reclamation work on Rio Grande.....		1,453,414,325
Total reductions by conferees—title I and title II.....		109,280,000

This omnibus authorization bill, H. R. 5472, for rivers and harbors and flood control covers the entire United States. I am particularly interested in it as it involves the great natural resources of the Columbia River Basin. As a member of the Public Works Committee which approved this bill in the House in the last session and by reason of being ranking member on the Flood Control Subcommittee, I was appointed by the Speaker as one of the conferees to consider the disagreeing votes between the House and the Senate on this bill.

There is included in the House bill a number of essential projects not only for the development of our natural resources in the Pacific Northwest area but also for flood control. These included the Albeni Falls Dam on the Columbia River in Idaho, which will firm up power in Bonneville and Grand Coulee and be the most available project for early completion to help meet the power shortage in the Portland area. The House bill also contained \$40,000,000 additional authorization for the Willamette Basin projects, authorization for the Johnson Creek project in the Portland area, levees on the Willamette River to protect Portland, at an estimated cost of \$14,722,000,000; lower Columbia bank protection and modification of levees along the lower Columbia, aggregating \$22,595,000. The total for Columbia River projects as the bill passed the House amounts to \$107,997,000. These items were unchanged by the Senate.

At the time the House bill was reported out of committee, the comprehensive 308 report had not been released by the Budget Bureau and therefore the House was unable to consider the projects contained in it. However, when the Public Works Committee of the Senate considered the bill recently this report had been released and the Senate included a number of additional projects in the Columbia River area, including the Willamette River. There were projects in disagreement considered by the conferees. The conferees approved all of these projects which had been approved by the Corps of Army Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget. They cover with a few exceptions all of the projects in the Columbia River Basin and Willamette River Basin which were to be constructed by the Army engineers and which were included in the comprehensive 308 report, providing for the long-range development of the resources of the Columbia River Basin. In addition to the approval of the projects themselves there was approved a monetary authorization for partial construction and for planning, the sum of \$75,000,000. This sum was a reduction from the amount authorized in the Senate amendments, but was in keeping with reductions made in other projects in the bill in order to bring the total amount of the bill to a minimum in monetary authorizations. The Army engineers advised me that this reduction in monetary authorizations will not militate against our interests in these developments. They are long-range developments extending over a number of years and additional authorizations can be made from time to time as

needed as the over-all program is developed by the Army engineers.

The authorizations in the Columbia and Willamette River areas added by the Senate and now approved by the conferees are as follows:

Power facilities at Lookout Point Dam, middle fork of the Willamette River.

Hills Creek Dam, middle fork of the Willamette River.

Dexter reregulating dam, middle fork, Willamette River.

Waldo Lake Tunnel and regulating works, middle-north fork, Willamette River.

Fall Creek Dam, Fall Creek, middle fork, Willamette River.

Holley Dam, Calapooya River.

Willamette Falls fish ladder, Willamette River.

Willamette River channel improvements, bank protection works, and channel clearing and snagging.

Libby Dam, Kootenai River, Mont.

Priest Rapids Dam, Columbia River, Wash.

John Day Dam, Columbia River, Wash. and Ore.

The Dalles Dam, Columbia River, Wash. and Ore.

Local flood-protection project at Pendleton, and Jackson Hole, Wyo.

Local flood-protection projects in the Columbia River Basin, Mont., Wyo., Utah, Nev., Idaho, Ore., and Wash., provided that with respect to these local flood-protection projects the following conditions shall apply:

First. Not to exceed \$15,000,000 of this authorization shall be available for these local flood-protection projects.

Second. All of the local flood-protection projects undertaken pursuant to this item shall be economically justified prior to construction.

Third. Local cooperation specified in the flood-control act approved June 22, 1936, as amended, shall be required.

During the 12 years I have served Oregon here in the Congress I have devoted a major portion of my time to the development, conservation, and utilization of the great natural resources of the Columbia River Basin, particularly as they appertain to power development, navigation, reclamation, and water utilization. The Columbia River, the second greatest in the United States and the greatest in power potentialities, is the cornerstone of the economy of the whole Northwest area. Its full development and utilization not only means success to industries in providing pay rolls, but also is a great boon to agricultural development and land utilization. Over 40 percent of the hydroelectric power of our Nation is bottled up in this great river and only about 10 percent of it has been developed thus far. These authorizations in this bill cover projects which, when constructed, will put the Northwest in the forefront of hydro-power development. It should not be overlooked that these great power developments are self-sustaining and every dollar with interest invested in them by the Federal Government is repaid in full. In fact, Bonneville is 10 years ahead of schedule in its repayment programs. The Federal Government should spend more money on

these projects which pay their own way and curtail expenditures in many of the activities which it has been carrying on of doubtful worth and which make no returns to the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I am a sincere advocate of economy in Federal expenditures and believe that we should cut out every expenditure which is not essential for the best interests of our country at this critical time. However, I do feel that it would be a grievous mistake to fail to make adequate appropriations for the conservation, development, and utilization of the great natural resources of our Nation upon which the very economy of our country depends. Unless we utilize these resources to the greatest economical extent we will not be able to meet our commitments at home and abroad and meet the ever-increasing financial obligations resting upon the Federal Government. For that reason I sincerely urge the approval of this conference report so that these great internal improvements in our country may be carried forward efficiently and expeditiously in order to maintain the economy of the Nation. Many of the projects, particularly those involving hydroelectric power, are self-liquidating and in the long run will repay the Federal Government all the moneys expended thereon.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I well recall last fall, in the first session of the Congress, when we had given consideration to this flood-control bill and had taken a wide range of testimony, then we drafted the bill. After we drafted the bill, the illustrious chairman of this committee will recall that we then went into executive session again, and we attempted to reduce, in every paragraph of this bill, every dollar that could possibly be cut out of it. That is exactly what we did. We reduced it by many millions. Then it went to the Senate. It has recently been acted upon by the Senate and is now before the House on a conference report. It is true the Senate added some few million dollars, because they were not able to get their testimony in earlier, but the entire, over-all bill at the present time amounts to a little less than \$1,500,000,000. Naturally, we would like to make some reductions that were written in by the other body, but it is the consensus of the leadership, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] that it would be futile to make these reductions and send it back to the Senate because they would put the amount back and we would have the bill in conference again. But when you consider this is spread over a 3-year period, we would be spending about \$500,000,000 a year to protect the cities and towns and villages and the rich farm land in the valleys in the entire Nation, it is certainly an investment that will pay off in big dividends.

If we do not pass this bill, we give no relief to our people at home. Do you know we are probably spending, through the ECA in other countries over the world, for flood control, industrialization

of plants, and so forth, amounts running to over a billion dollars a year. Here we are asking for flood control for this great country of ours only about \$500,000,000 a year, when you consider it is spread over a 3-year period. Let us do this much for our own people in protecting our own resources. We had better do this and cut down on our overseas spending.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, it is with considerable apprehension that I find that in the final draft of the flood-control bill, as embodied in the provisions of the conference report, the appropriation for the revetments and flood protection at Bonner's Ferry, Idaho, have been left out. That means that if we do not build the Libby Dam first and protect the extensive areas behind the levees in the diking districts of the Kootenai Valley at Bonner's Ferry, by striking out that appropriation, that country will be left to the mercy of the floods of Kootenai River. We must build the Libby Dam first, to take care of and protect the rich farming land in that valley.

I hope some subsequent appropriation will be made to take care of Bonner's Ferry and the Kootenai Valley district, since they have been left out of this bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to express my sincere regrets that our very distinguished and able friend the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] will not be a candidate again for Congress. As chairman of the Public Works Committee he will be greatly missed. His long years of experience in the Congress, particularly on rivers and harbors, eminently qualified him for the chairmanship of this great committee. He has been a willing servant of public duty, conscientiously performing his work with energy and resourcefulness on all public matters that were before him.

Over the years he has turned in a remarkable performance of which he can well be proud. He has been fair and square and tolerant and patient with us on all of the many problems that have been presented to him. His work has won for him the hearty commendations, respect, and admiration of the membership of both sides of the aisle. He is an outstanding American and I regret that he is leaving the Congress of the United States.

Now I want to say a word to my good friend, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. I might tell the very distinguished gentleman that if he will look after his own State of Mississippi, we who represent Pennsylvania, will look after the affairs of Pennsylvania. Pennsylvania is a great State of 10,000,000

people, a State that sent 1,400,000 men and women into the last World War, a State that produced some 30 to 35 percent of the war materials, a State that has a magnificent record. Nature has blessed Pennsylvania with great natural resources—coal, oil and gas. We are the leading steel-producing State in the Nation and we have built a great system of highways, waterways, and railways. We have the finest workmen in the world. We are one of the leading agricultural States in the Union. All these factors combine to make our State the industrial titan of America. This great State of ours built soundly and well on the foundation of free enterprise—the American way.

Pennsylvania pays into the Federal Treasury approximately 10 percent of all the taxes collected by the Federal Government. So if the TVA, about which the gentleman is talking, cost \$800,000,000, Pennsylvania has contributed \$80,000,000 to make possible the development of the TVA to produce cheap power for the industrial rehabilitation and protection of the Tennessee Valley. Instead of being critical of the great State of Pennsylvania, which I am proud and honored to represent, I think the gentleman from Mississippi should be paying tribute to us as a great State because without our energy, industry, and resourcefulness, and without our great natural resources and without our tremendous contribution to the Federal Treasury TVA would not have been possible.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I shall find it necessary to vote against this conference report on rivers and harbors and flood control. It amounts, according to figures submitted, to \$1,538,044,325, of which \$228,300,000 is for rivers and harbors, and \$1,334,000,000 for flood control.

I do not want to be misunderstood. I am in favor of flood control, and I am in favor of the improvement of the rivers and harbors in this country where it is the obligation of the Federal Government to appropriate funds for that purpose. However, I want to direct your attention to this particular bill.

As near as I can figure it out, this bill has been increased by the Senate to the extent of \$335,828,150. In other words, after the bill was voted by the House it went to the other body, where more than a third of a billion dollars was added. Not only that, but these items, making up \$335,000,000, were not even considered or debated in the House of Representatives and were not considered by the House Committee on Public Works, except over a period of about 2 days. So the situation is this: The House, upon the recommendation of the Public Works Committee, after prolonged hearings were held, approved a bill amounting to a billion dollars. Then it went to the Senate, where a half billion dollars was added, and the House has reduced the Senate increase about 30 percent, leaving a net increase of \$335,000,000 that was put in by the Senate and is about to be approved by the House without any debate and without hearings in the House committee.

Mr. Speaker, this is a real "pork barrel" bill. There is something in it for almost every area and every section of the country. I wish I had time to read the items to you, but you will find them—East, West, North, and South, Middle States, and all.

Mr. Speaker, it is my contention that where projects have been started and are presently under way, those projects should be completed in regular order. There may be a few additional projects because of critical circumstances that ought to be considered, but I call your attention to the fact that more than one-half of the amount allocated under this bill is for new projects of various kinds that have not yet been started, and you know that when a project is once authorized and some allocations are made, the Federal Government is obligated to continue and complete such projects. So let no one misunderstand that when you vote for this bill today, you are obligating your Government for another \$1,500,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the time to obligate the Federal Treasury and the taxpayers of this country for any amount more than is absolutely necessary, and these authorizations should be made in consideration of absolute need and not on the basis of the demand for the authorization and expenditure of more and more funds.

I concede that many of these projects are worthy and are entitled to every reasonable consideration that may be granted, but in view of the condition of the Federal Treasury, and considering the fact that our expenditures during the fiscal year will be \$6,000,000,000 more than our revenue, the fair and reasonable thing to do is to send this bill back to the committee for further consideration.

It is not fair, neither is it right, that this House should be called upon to authorize the expenditure of such a tremendous amount of money, a great part of which was never debated in the House and barely considered by the great House Committee on Public Works. I know it will be said that this only authorizes the expenditure of funds, but Members of this House know full well that once you authorize and obligate your Government, you are expected to appropriate funds to pay the bill. This is too much money. I shall vote against the conference report.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I remind the House that all Members have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD. Having no further requests for time, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 101, noes 33.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken and there were—yeas 210, nays 137, not voting 83, as follows:

[Roll No. 148]

YEAS—210

Abernethy	Gathings	Monroney
Addonizio	Gavin	Morris
Albert	Gillette	Multer
Allen, Calif.	Golden	Murdock
Allen, Ill.	Gore	Murray, Tenn.
Allen, La.	Granahan	Nicholson
Anderson, Calif.	Granger	Norblad
Angell	Green	Norrell
Aspinall	Gregory	Norton
Auchincloss	Gross	O'Konski
Bailey	Hagen	O'Neill
Barden	Hale	O'Sullivan
Baring	Hardy	Passman
Barrett, Pa.	Hare	Patman
Barrett, Wyo.	Harris	Patten
Bates, Ky.	Hart	Perkins
Beckworth	Havenner	Peterson
Bennett, Mich.	Hays, Ark.	Philbin
Bentsen	Hébert	Phillips, Calif.
Bishop	Hedrick	Phillips, Tenn.
Blackney	Heffernan	Potter
Blatnik	Herlong	Poulson
Boggs, La.	Hill	Preston
Bolton, Md.	Hinshaw	Price
Bonner	Hobbs	Priest
Bosone	Hoeven	Rankin
Bramblett	Hollifield	Redden
Brooks	Holmes	Reed, Ill.
Brown, Ga.	Horan	Richards
Bryson	Howell	Rivers
Buchanan	Hull	Rodino
Buckley, Ill.	Jackson, Wash.	Rooney
Buckley, N. Y.	Jenison	Roosevelt
Burdick	Jensen	Sadowski
Burnside	Johnson	Sanborn
Camp	Jones, Mo.	Saylor
Carnahan	Karst	Scudder
Carroll	Kearns	Secrest
Case, S. Dak.	Kelley, Pa.	Sheppard
Chelf	Kelly, N. Y.	Sikes
Chlperfield	Kerr	Simpson, Ill.
Christopher	Kilday	Spence
Colmer	King	Staggers
Combs	Kirwan	Stefan
Cooper	Lane	Stigler
Corbett	Lanham	Stockman
Cox	Larcade	Sullivan
Cunningham	LeCompte	Tackett
Curtis	Lemke	Talle
Davenport	Lovre	Thomas
Davis, Ga.	Lucas	Thompson
Davis, Tenn.	Lyle	Thornberry
D'Ewart	Lynch	Tollefson
Dollinger	McCormack	Trimble
Dolliver	McDonough	Vinson
Dondero	McGuire	Vursell
Donchue	McKinnon	Welch
Doyle	McMillan, S. C.	Wardel
Eberhart	Mack, Wash.	White, Idaho
Ellsworth	Magee	Whitten
Engel, Mich.	Mansfield	Whittington
Evins	Marcantonio	Williams
Fenton	Marsalis	Willis
Fernandez	Martin, Iowa	Wilson, Tex.
Flood	Merrow	Winstead
Forand	Meyer	Withrow
Frazier	Michener	Wolcott
Fugate	Miller, Calif.	Wood
Fulton	Mills	Woodhouse
Furcolo	Mitchell	

NAYS—137

Abbitt	Canfield	Eaton
Andersen,	Cannon	Elston
H. Carl	Case, N. J.	Fallon
Andresen,	Celler	Feighan
August H.	Chatham	Fellows
Arends	Chesney	Fogarty
Bates, Mass.	Clemente	Ford
Beall	Clevenger	Garmatz
Biemiller	Cole, Kans.	Gary
Boggs, Del.	Cole, N. Y.	Gordon
Bolling	Cotton	Gorski
Bolton, Ohio	Coudert	Graham
Brehm	Crawford	Gwinn
Brown, Ohio	Dague	Hall
Bulwinkle	Davis, Wis.	Edwin Arthur
Burleson	Delaney	Halleck
Burton	Doughton	Hand
Byrnes, Wis.	Durham	Harrison

Harvey	McCulloch	Scott, Hardie
Hays, Ohio	McGregor	Scott,
Herter	Mack, Ill.	Hugh D., Jr.
Hesseltun	Macy	Scrivner
Hoffman, Mich.	Mahon	Shaffer
Hope	Marshall	Simpson, Pa.
Huber	Martin, Mass.	Sims
Irving	Mason	Smith, Kans.
Jackson, Calif.	Miller, Md.	Smith, Va.
James	Morton	Smith, Wis.
Javits	Murray, Wis.	Stanley
Jennings	Nelson	Steed
Jonas	O'Brien, Ill.	Taber
Jones, N. C.	O'Hara, Ill.	Tauriello
Judd	O'Toole	Teague
Karsten	Patterson	Towe
Kearney	Pickett	Van Zandt
Keating	Poage	Vorys
Kennedy	Polk	Wagner
Kilburn	Rabaut	Walter
Latham	Reed, N. Y.	Weichel
Norton	Rees	Widnall
LeFevre	Ribicoff	Wier
Lesinski	Rich	Wigglesworth
Lichtenwalter	Richman	Wilson, Okla.
Lind	Rogers, Mass.	Wolverton
Linehan	Sadlak	Yates
Lodge	St. George	Young
McCarthy	Sasscer	Zablocki
McConnell		

NOT VOTING—83

Andrews	Harden	Pfeiffer,
Battle	Heller	William L.
Bennett, Fla.	Hoffman, Ill.	Plumley
Boydin	Jacobs	Powell
Breen	Jenkins	Quinn
Burke	Jones, Ala.	Rains
Byrne, N. Y.	Kean	Ramsay
Carlyle	Kee	Regan
Cavalcante	Keefe	Rhodes
Chudoff	Keogh	Rogers, Fla.
Cooley	Klein	Sabath
Crook	Kruse	Shelley
Crosser	Kunkel	Short
Davies, N. Y.	McGrath	Smathers
Dawson	McMillen, Ill.	Smith, Ohio
Deane	McSweeney	Sutton
DeGraffenried	Madden	Taylor
Denton	Miles	Underwood
Dingell	Miller, Nebr.	Velde
Douglas	Morgan	Wadsworth
Elliot	Morrison	Walsh
Engle, Calif.	Moulder	Wheeler
Fisher	Nixon	Whitaker
Gamble	Noland	White, Calif.
Gilmer	O'Brien, Mich.	Wickersham
Goodwin	O'Hara, Minn.	Wilson, Ind.
Gossett	Pace	Woodruff
Grant	Pfeifer,	
Hall,	Joseph L.	

Leonard W.

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Smathers for, with Mr. Leonard W. Hall against.

Mr. Wickersham for, with Mr. William L. Pfeiffer against.

Mr. Klein for, with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois against.

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Short against.

Mr. Joseph L. Pfeiffer for, with Mr. Smith of Ohio against.

Mr. Heller for, with Mr. Taylor against.

Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Kean against.

Mr. Gilmer for, with Mr. Davies of New York against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Bennett of Florida with Mr. Goodwin.

Mr. Rhodes with Mr. Wadsworth.

Mr. McGrath with Mr. Kunkel.

Mr. Engle of California with Mr. Nixon.

Mr. McSweeney with Mr. Velde.

Mr. Burke with Mr. Woodruff.

Mr. Battle with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.

Mr. Crook with Mrs. Harden.

Mr. Madden with Mr. Jenkins.

Mr. Dean with Mr. McMillen of Illinois.

Mr. Morgan with Mr. Plumley.

Mr. Wheeler with Mr. Miller of Nebraska.

Mr. Whitaker with Mr. Keefe.

Mr. White of California with Mr. Gamble.

Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. BURTON, Mr. HAYS of Ohio, Mr. CANNON, Mr. SASSCER, Mr. BEALL, Mr. KARSTEN, Mr. JACKSON of California, and Mr. WAGNER changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and in each include an editorial.

Mr. CLEVELER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include an article.

Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include certain information.

Mr. POTTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include two newspaper articles.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by Alvin Bloch on the subject Cargoes and Pacific Northwest Power.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter.

Mr. KENNEDY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial appearing in the Christian Science Monitor.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Brooklyn Eagle.

Mr. BLATNIK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include two articles.

Mr. KARST asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article from the magazine Machinists.

Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous material.

Mrs. WOODHOUSE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include two editorials.

Mr. GORDON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech commemorating the one hundred and fifty-ninth anniversary of the Polish Constitution.

Mr. BOLLING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article entitled "Congressional Subpena Upon the President."

Mr. GORSKI, Mr. CHESNEY, and Mr. ELSTON asked and were given permission to extend their remarks.

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. ROOSEVELT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a copy of the bill entitled "Niagara Redevelopment Act of 1950" and an analysis of the bill.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in five instances and in each include extraneous matter.

GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7786, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

CHAPTER VII. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The CHAIRMAN. General debate on all chapters of the bill has been concluded.

The Clerk will now continue reading the bill for amendments, beginning with chapter VII, page 216, line 1.

The Clerk read as follows:

WORKING-CAPITAL FUND

For establishment of a working-capital fund, to be available without fiscal year limitation, for expenses necessary for the maintenance and operation of (1) a central reproduction service; (2) communication services; (3) a central supply service for stationery, supplies, equipment, blank forms, and miscellaneous materials, for which adequate stocks may be maintained to meet in whole or in part requirements of the bureaus and offices of the Department in the city of Washington and elsewhere; (4) a central library service; (5) health services; and (6) such other similar service functions as the Secretary determines may be performed more advantageously on a reimbursable basis; \$300,000. Said fund shall be reimbursed from available funds of bureaus, offices, and agencies for which services are performed at rates which will return in full all expenses of operation, including reserves for accrued annual leave and depreciation of equipment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language on page 217, lines 4 to 6, beginning with the figure "6," and reading as follows:

(6) such other similar service functions as the Secretary determines may be performed more advantageously on a reimbursable basis.

I ask leave to reserve the point of order and to propound a question of the chairman of the subcommittee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves the point of order.

Mr. KEATING. Will the chairman of the subcommittee or the ranking mi-

nority member of the committee explain the purpose of this provision?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. In response to the inquiry of the gentleman, may I say that the purpose of this language is to centralize the service functions within the department of the office of the Secretary. It does not involve any additional expenditures. Frankly, the purpose of it is to save money.

Mr. KEATING. Has this language been carried in previous appropriation bills?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The identical language has not been carried before, but the substance has been very much the same.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

For construction and acquisition of transmission lines, substations, and appurtenant facilities, and for administrative expenses connected therewith, in carrying out the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U. S. C. 825s), as applied to the southwestern power area, to remain available until expended, \$10,350,000, of which not to exceed \$5,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority previously granted; and, in addition, the Secretary is authorized to enter into contracts for the purposes of this appropriation in an amount not to exceed \$6,000,000: *Provided*, That the unexpended balances of funds appropriated under the head "Construction, operation, and maintenance, power transmission facilities" in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1950, for the foregoing purposes shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language on page 218, starting in line 5, reading as follows: "And, in addition, the Secretary is authorized to enter into contracts for the purposes of this appropriation in an amount not to exceed \$6,000,000: *Provided*, That the unexpended balances of funds appropriated under the head 'Construction, operation, and maintenance, power-transmission facilities' in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1950, for the foregoing purposes shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation" on the ground it involves legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman reserve the point of order?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I will be glad to reserve the point of order.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, this is the same thing that has been happening around here for several years and occurs every time we have reached the item covering the Southwestern Power Administration. I think every Member of the Committee will agree with me when I say that the Southwestern Power Administration has given one demonstration in the United States of America where the Government and private industry can get along.

About 2 or 3 years ago the Southwestern Power Administration and the Department of the Interior made a contract with the Texas Power & Light Co.

for the interchange and the distribution of power at this place. It is one contract that the Southwestern Power Administration has lived up to 100 percent and that the Texas Power & Light Co. has lived up to 100 percent. It has been a valuable contract both for the Government and for the Texas Power & Light Co., and neither the Government nor the Texas Power & Light Co. would for a moment think of doing away with that contract today.

The Administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration sat down with the utilities of the State of Oklahoma and they have drawn a contract that the utilities themselves are very much for and that the Southwestern Power Administration is also for. That contract is on the desk of the Secretary of the Interior now. If it is signed the \$6,000,000 provided for in this bill will not be expended because instead of building these lines there will be a contract between them.

When this thing first came up for consideration here I stood up on the floor of this House and said: "I do not believe in the confiscation of property."

There is a certain group of people in the United States who do not think there ought to be any public power. There is another group that does not think there ought to be any private power. I do not belong to either group. If we are allowed to, we are going to endeavor to make a satisfactory contract with every power company in that part of the country that, as I say, will be mutually beneficial to the Government and beneficial to the power companies themselves.

We have never paralleled a line of any power company. I made the statement here, and let me repeat, that I am not out to confiscate anybody's property, that where the power companies with an existing line had the capacity to carry the power of the Southwestern Power Administration and would carry it at a reasonable rate, that we would not parallel or build any line adjacent thereto, and that has not been done in one instance in the State of Texas where the Texas Power & Light Co. operates. We hope to get that same kind of an arrangement in Oklahoma, and we will have it if this contract that is now lying on the desk of the Secretary of the Interior is approved by him.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I want to say that the distinguished Speaker has explained this matter exactly and in accordance with the facts, and that we are, as the gentleman has just explained, working out a very satisfactory program between the Southwestern Power Administration and the private utilities in the Southwest area. Now, for the first time in the history of this Nation, do we have a working agreement that is going to be good for everyone concerned. I am happy to say that the Speaker and I see this thing exactly alike. As the Speaker has just said, there are some folks who think

there should be no public power and there are some folks who think there should be no private power. The Speaker and I belong to neither one of those groups. Certainly, by striking this out, it would interfere with the program that we have in progress now and we are working out and solving these differences which have bothered us for years and years. I am sorry the gentleman from New York made the point of order, and I hope he will withdraw it.

Mr. RAYBURN. I trust that under the circumstances the gentleman may feel that he could, in good conscience, withdraw his point of order, because, following up exactly what the gentleman from Iowa has said, we are trying to make things work down in the Southwest, and as far as we have been able to go, they are working.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished Speaker yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I associate myself with the views of the Speaker and the gentleman from Iowa in reference to public and private power. Do I understand from the Speaker that, if the negotiations pending are concluded, that this \$6,000,000 contract authority will not be exercised?

Mr. RAYBURN. The gentleman is right. The Administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration stated before both a House committee and a Senate committee that, if this contract was signed, this money would not be expended.

Mr. KEATING. And the Speaker, from his knowledge of this situation, would be led to believe that the contract is likely to be signed?

Mr. RAYBURN. Well, I hope that the contract is signed. I have seen it; I have gone over it very thoroughly, as I did the Texas Power & Light Co. contract. I think it is a good contract, and I trust that the Secretary of the Interior does sign it.

Mr. KEATING. This particular contract authority would only need to be exercised in the event the contract did not come into being.

Mr. RAYBURN. I think that is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York withdraw his point of order?

Mr. KEATING. I would like to reserve it further, if I may.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CANNON. I did not hear the point of order submitted, Mr. Chairman, but I fail to see where the debate we have had up to this time touches on any point of order. Merely as a matter of information, what is the purpose of the debate?

Mr. RAYBURN. The purpose of this debate was that I was hoping, feeling that I was right, that I could prevail upon the gentleman from New York to withdraw his point of order. That was the purpose of my taking the floor for

the only time I have taken it in the 2 or 3 weeks since this bill has been under consideration.

Mr. CANNON. I am told that the Secretary and the friends of REA are opposed to the Texas contract and do not think it ought to be signed in this form.

Mr. RAYBURN. It does not make any difference to anybody whether or not they are opposed to the Texas contract. It has been in operation for more than 2 years.

The Secretary of the Interior found some parts of the contract to which he is objecting. I am trusting that Mr. Wright and the power companies can get together and yet bring about an amendment to that contract that the Secretary of the Interior will sign.

Mr. CANNON. I am not familiar with the merits of the various forms of contract but it is my understanding that the cooperatives in my State and other States do not favor the Texas contract and as a result this particular contract has been on the desk of the Secretary for many weeks; for a very long time, at least.

Mr. RAYBURN. It has not been there a very long time. I hope the gentleman does not get me into personalities, but I know there is one man in the country that claims to represent the co-ops of the country, but the principal thing he is doing is going around stirring up trouble between the Southwestern Power Administration and the co-ops of the country. He is performing no service, in my opinion, either to public power or to the co-ops.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. May I say to the Speaker and to the House that I think you know how I have felt all along about public and private power. They tell me the Texas contract has acted decently, and has been a constructive step in the relationship of public and private power. It was a good step.

The Speaker is correct when he says that the Oklahoma utilities will enter this same contract. May I say to the Speaker that the Arkansas utilities will do the same thing.

I join the Speaker in asking that this contract, similar to the Texas contract, be approved by the Secretary of the Interior regardless of what somebody may say because, as the Speaker has so well said, some people want to take over the whole thing and make it public, while others would not have any public power at all. As the solution is reached here, public and private power can live together, if the Interior Department will be governed by what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] has said.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FENTON. I join my colleagues in saying that Mr. Wright made a very fine presentation to the subcommittee. Everything the Speaker has said is absolutely true, because I took occasion to

call up the Secretary of the Interior a day or two ago and ask him the status of the various contracts that were on his table. He said he was hopeful that very shortly he could make final arrangements for those contracts.

Mr. Douglas Wright is to be commended on his explanation. He made a very fine presentation. Of course, he has taken the position that we do, that where private enterprise can supply power it should be supplied by them, and the same goes for transmission lines. I hope the distinguished gentleman from Texas will try to expedite these contracts so that we can protect free enterprise in this business.

Mr. RAYBURN. That is what the gentleman from Texas is trying to do.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I want first to make clear that I am not claiming to speak for all the REA cooperatives throughout the Nation. I have felt that they have done great work, their leadership was good, and that I do not claim to have done more than my share, but there have been times when I have tried to be as helpful toward this program as possible. I do, therefore, believe I can fairly speak as a friend of the REA program and as one who lives in the area that is served by the Texas Power & Light Co. and by some of these REA-financed cooperatives and some public dams, and by one of the largest REA transmission cooperatives, I want to point out that the "Texas contract" has been working in our area over the past 2 years and that we now have the best relations between the private power companies, the public dams, and the REA cooperatives, both local and transmission cooperatives, that we have ever had. It seems to me that, under this contract, we have the assurance we are going to have all of these agencies working in cooperation without any duplication of effort or lines. A few years ago we had no cooperation and no way of getting the private companies to cooperate except to build competitive facilities. When we proved we could and would do just that the companies signed the Texas contract, and we are today enjoying the best of relations. If you deny the people of Oklahoma and Arkansas the bargaining power that this bill gives, I fear that you are going to force them into a useless war of duplication, which should be avoided.

Mr. RAYBURN. The contract has worked. We are getting plenty of power and getting it at reasonable rates.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Does the gentleman feel that to eliminate this provision would interfere with the negotiations and arrangements which are under way to which he has referred?

Mr. RAYBURN. It might take away from one side a little of its argument, I am afraid.

Mr. KEATING. In view of the representations of our Speaker, in whom we

all have so much confidence, Mr. Chairman, I do not feel I care to take the responsibility of striking this provision out on a point of order. If some other Member wishes to do so that is their privilege.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, some of the preceding speeches, unintentionally I am sure, have tended to becloud the issue. Some of the preceding speakers, both pro and con, have assumed that the provision in the pending bill to which the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] has interposed a point of order in some way involves a conflict or controversy between the Southwestern Power Administration and private utility companies. This is completely erroneous. My colleague from Texas, the distinguished Speaker of the House, pointed out in the course of his speech that a contract has been negotiated between the Southwestern Power Administration and all of the utility companies of the area, which contract is now awaiting approval of the Secretary of the Interior. The contract is a lengthy one, and I have made no special study of it. But I have read it and understand the purpose it is intended to accomplish.

The contract in no wise gives private electric companies a monopoly on federally owned power. The effect is just the opposite. It would give priority to such preferred customers as REA and others which the Government desires to sell power from the federally owned generating plants and installations. What it would do is to intergrade the power transmission facilities owned by the Southwestern Power Administration and those owned by the private companies, thus making it unnecessary for the Government to spend large sums of money in the construction of transmission lines paralleling those of the private companies. These contracts have been strongly recommended by Mr. Douglas Wright of the Southwestern Power Administration. As has already been stated, Mr. Wright told the Appropriations Committee that if the contract is approved he will not need to spend a penny or contract for a penny of the \$5,000,000 authorized to which the point of order has been interposed. By intergrading the distribution system of the private companies and the Southwestern Power Administration millions of dollars will be saved to the public in the years ahead. It is foolish and wasteful to duplicate distribution systems when by proper cooperation and coordination it is wholly unnecessary.

The negotiation of the contract, in my judgment, is a fine thing. I think it will set a proper pattern for the distribution of public power. It will mark out the territory and proper field of service of such Government instrumentalities as Southwestern Power Administration and the private utility companies. I, for one, do not want to see private utility companies or other private enterprises absorbed or driven out of business by the Federal Government. On the other hand, power produced by these huge hydroelectric plants, made possible and

paid for by the taxpayers of the United States, belongs to all our people and should never be allowed either to be owned or monopolized by private concerns. I think the contracts in question point the way to a proper cooperation between the private companies and Government power corporations. It will mean cheaper and better electric service than either the Government or the private utility companies could supply alone. It is subject to Government regulation and supervision in the interest of the public good. The approval of the contract by the Secretary of Interior, and I sincerely trust he will approve it, will go a long way to stop the clamor of those who argue that it is the purpose of the Government to take over or socialize the private utility business. And it will, in my judgment, work to the great benefit of the users of electric power and to the American people.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of power transmission facilities and of marketing electric power and energy pursuant to the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U. S. C. 825a), as applied to the southwestern power area, \$760,000.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot agree with what has been said about my distinguished friend Clyde Ellis, former Member of the House, and the association which he represents.

This is public power that is generated by the Southwest Power Administration. It is created by the Government and belongs to the public.

We had the same battle in the Tennessee Valley. If we had capitulated and turned it over to the Electric Bond & Share, and that is who the Texas Power & Light Co. is, we would be paying through the nose for our electricity today.

The State that ought to have the cheapest electricity on earth is the State of Texas. They have natural gas spouting into thin air, enough to generate electricity for four or five States the size of Texas. They also have an abundance of oil to run all the Diesel engines necessary to supply electricity to the people of Texas. Yet, I want to read you the statistics for 1948. In 1948 the State of Texas used 8,484,641,000 kilowatt hours of electricity for which it paid \$165,000,000. That is the ultimate consumers paid \$165,000,000. Under the TVA rate they would have paid \$86,000,000 and would have saved about \$78,000,000. I know some of you will say that the TVA pays no taxes. We pay more money in lieu of taxes than was paid by the private power company before the TVA was established.

In 1948 the people of Texas used 8,484,000,000 kilowatt hours of electricity, and the people of Tennessee used 4,348,000,000 kilowatt hours. The people of Tennessee paid \$68,000,000 for their electricity, and the people of Texas paid \$165,000,000, or \$97,000,000 more than did the people of Tennessee.

Let us see what would happen under the Tacoma, Wash., rates. I have used Tacoma, Wash., for years, because it is one city in America which has a public power system operated by water power generated at dams 100 miles around the city. Tacoma has built her own dams. Instead of paying \$165,000,000 for that power, the people of Texas, under Tacoma rates, would have paid \$74,000,000, or about \$90,000,000 less than they did pay. They would have paid \$82,000,000 under the Ontario and would have saved about the same amount—\$82,000,000.

I do not agree that this power should be monopolized by the Electric Bond & Share Co. I know what the Electric Bond & Share Co. is, because I have had to fight them in Mississippi. They do not own an insulator in the district which I have the honor to represent.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. I just wanted to ask the gentleman if the area in which Tacoma, Wash., is located is not the only area that had a power shortage during the war and after the war.

Mr. RANKIN. The area in which Tacoma is located did what they did on the Tennessee River. They helped produce the atomic bomb. If it had not been for the Columbia River development and the Tennessee Valley Authority, there would not have been any atomic bomb. The reason was that they put these enterprises there because they had the power; and because they used more than anybody thought they would use, there was a shortage in some of the area.

Mr. NORRELL. There was a power shortage.

Mr. RANKIN. Not in Tacoma, Wash., where they have their own power facilities.

The situation in Arkansas is worse than it is in Texas.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] spends considerable time at every opportunity telling you people how much money you are losing by allowing private enterprise to survive. He tells you exactly how many dollars you could save on your electric bill if the Government owned and sold all of the electricity. He could just as easily tell you that you could buy your clothes a lot cheaper at a Government-owned clothing store that is free from taxation and is being subsidized by the taxpayers. There is not one speck of difference in the arguments.

Those who would have public power and drive private enterprise out of the field are the same ones that would like to see the Federal Government run and own everything in this whole country.

I was amused the other day when the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] jumped up on the floor of the House during the farm-program debate and said, "If you keep going like you are going now, it is not going to be long until the Federal Government is going to be telling you farmers exactly how many

hogs you can raise, how many chickens you can feed, and how many cows you can milk." He was exactly right at that time. But when public power is concerned he does not seem to care if the rural people of this country are regimented even by a contract circumventing the wishes of those people, and their Congress. You notice he never could find Arkansas in his list of mistreated people because of high rates.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TACKETT. Not now. You have had the floor ever since I have been here. The little rural electric co-ops in the Tennessee Valley are paying more for their electricity than they are in Arkansas. The cheapest electricity to the rural co-ops in the whole United States of America is in the State of Arkansas, and we do not have any Tennessee Valley Authority that is dodging taxes and having their accounts so hidden that you cannot tell what it costs to make electricity.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TACKETT. I yield to my friend from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Douglas Wright testified before my subcommittee that the utilities in Arkansas, especially in my area, were selling power cheaper to the REA than the Southwest Power Administration could sell or the TVA. That is in the public hearings.

Mr. TACKETT. And that is exactly correct. The electricity being sold to the co-ops in my district is sold at between 4.6 mills and 4.9 mills. Can you buy it like that over in the Tennessee Valley?

Mr. RANKIN. I will give you the figures. The residential consumers of Arkansas last year paid \$10,260.00 for electricity which, under the TVA yardstick would have cost \$4,980,000. In other words, they paid a hundred percent more than they should.

Mr. TACKETT. What would they have paid for it from the Federal Government?

Mr. RANKIN. They would have paid just what I am talking about. You are plundering the ultimate consumers of electricity all over the State of Arkansas.

Mr. TACKETT. What would they have paid for it?

Mr. RANKIN. They would have paid a whole lot less than they paid in Arkansas.

Mr. TACKETT. The gentleman does not know what electricity is selling for and does not seem to care; he is just trying to fool the people. TVA does not and cannot sell electricity for 4.6 or 4.9 mills.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Arkansas does not seem to realize the difference between public and private business.

Mr. TACKETT. I think I have sense enough to know that if the Federal Government is running something for the people that it is public business. When private people in this country get out here and compete on the theory of supply and demand, that is the kind of business that has made this the greatest country upon the face of the earth,

but it cannot be for long if we are going to permit the Federal Government to gobble up the business of the people of this country. Did the gentleman from Iowa want me to yield to him?

Mr. JENSEN. I think it might be well to point out that private industry, whether it be private utilities, the farmer, the peanut vendor on the corner, the corner grocery store, or anything else, pays taxes, and if it were not for those taxes coming into the Federal Government, just as the gentleman from Pennsylvania stated a while ago, there would be no money to build these great things like TVA. The private utility companies last year paid over \$650,000,000 in local, State, and Federal taxes. That is considerably more than what the gentleman from Mississippi said, and all the figures he puts in the Record trying to prove benefit to the people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TACKETT. The gentleman from Mississippi, if the gentleman will pardon me, has proved one thing, that the Federal Government without paying taxes, that the Federal Government being subsidized by the taxpayers, that the Federal Government by hiding the figures that it actually costs to produce electricity can sell electricity cheaper than private enterprise can produce and sell it. That is exactly what he said; and the same thing is true of groceries, clothing, or anything else. I am wondering how the gentleman proposes to operate this Government after taxpaying enterprise has been abolished.

I should like to call your attention for just a moment to the Southwestern Power Administration. It came before this House and asked for money to build steam power generating units and transmission lines. Congress said: "No; we are not going to put the Federal Government into competition with private enterprise; we still believe in the principles of democracy."

They came back again and they said: "We have got to have the money to build steam-power units and transmission lines because there is just so much water coming down the river at certain seasons of the year; we need to firm up the power and sell it the year round."

Congress said: "No; we are still not going to build a TVA all over the United States."

Then, what did the Southwestern Power Administration do? They oozed over here and got hold of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association's executive manager from my great State of Arkansas, Mr. Clyde Ellis. They said: "Now, Clyde, we cannot get Congress to go along with us, but we can work out a deal here whereby we can circumvent the very Congress that is refusing to go along with us. Here is what we will do: Let us enter into a contract whereby rural co-ops will build electric generating

and transmission facilities for the use and benefit of the Southwestern Power Administration. We will pretend that those facilities are for the use and benefit of the co-ops, and thereby circumvent Congress and fool the people. Mr. Wickard will do whatever you want him to do; he has a blank check provided by Congress to do whatever needs to be done for the REA program. You ask for loans to build some facilities down there in the State of Arkansas and elsewhere. Then you go in there and build for the SPA some steam power units and transmission lines that Congress would not give us, and then the Southwestern Power Administration will use those generating facilities and transmission lines for a period of 40 years for a certain rent to be paid by the taxpayers that will retire the construction cost. Southwestern Power Administration is all set to operate and to buy those transmission lines from the date they are constructed. The generating facilities will be worn out before they are paid for, but we will have the transmission facilities and be well on our way toward the abolishment of private enterprise."

The SPA gets the money from the taxpayers through the continuing fund to carry out the very thing the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is working for, the abolition of free enterprise in the power field. That contract even provides, I may say to the gentleman from Mississippi who has been fighting FEPC with all the power at his command, for the civil-rights program, including the FEPC features so detested by the gentleman from Mississippi. If the gentleman would read what he is hollering about, he would not be so condescending of the public-power contract. That contract provides that the Southwestern Power Administration shall determine the policies of the little rural electric co-ops in your State and in my State. In other words, that little group of rural electric co-op board members will no longer determine the policies; and the wishes of the little co-ops will not amount to a tinker's hoot because the Federal Government through the Southwestern Power Administration is going to socialize, federalize, and nationalize the electric industry and regiment the farmers of this country to such an extent that it will not be long until the Government is going to be telling the farmers, as you have predicted Mr. RANKIN, how many chickens they can feed, how many hogs they can raise, and how many cows they can milk.

I wish that the gentleman, if he actually believes in what he has been saying in the past, would find out what the electrification program of the Southwestern Power Administration is actually doing to our rural people.

Mr. RANKIN. Doing them more good all the time. Public power is doing the people I represent more good than anything that has ever come along.

Mr. TACKETT. The gentleman is unable to distinguish public power from rural electrification. Public power is socialistic, while rural electrification is operating in free enterprise.

Mr. RANKIN. The Electric Bond & Share Co., which is a holding company, is bleeding the people of Arkansas and Texas to the extent of over \$150,000,000 a year in overcharges.

Mr. TACKETT. May I say to the gentleman from Mississippi that every Socialist who has even advocated taking over the principles of democracy has advocated, first, taking over the electric-power systems, second, taking over the telephone and communication systems, and third, taking over the railroads and other transportation systems, the necessary steps to socialize America. The gentleman is helping them to climb these steps.

Mr. RANKIN. When I took this up in 1934—

Mr. TACKETT. That is popular, Mr. RANKIN, but it is not right and you know it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired. Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is too bad we do not have something in the House to blow the smoke away so we could take a look around. We have just listened to a Power Trust speech so good that I doubt if anybody on the left-hand side of this aisle could equal it. I do not think I ever heard a better one from that standpoint.

There are a few little things I want to discuss that are happening out in Missouri. You know, we are not so far from Arkansas. In fact, I have been across the State line down there two different times at least. My REA co-op, the Osage Valley Electric co-op, is paying 1.6 for current wholesale right now, and I hope to be able to hitch on with a couple of lines in the State of Arkansas and get a little hydroelectric current up there so that we can reduce the price at wholesale.

We have had two steam plants authorized for our State and there has been quite a lot of objection to it. I want to tell you Members of the House something. Independence, which is the home of President Truman at the present time, is a suburb of Kansas City. When you drive out Truman Road you cannot tell when you are driving out of Kansas City and entering Independence. It is all one town.

The Kansas City Power & Light Co. has been one of the utilities that has been fighting the construction of these lines into Missouri and those two steam-generating plants on the Missouri River. But I want to tell you something. Independence, Mo., will not buy its current from the Kansas City Power & Light Co. although it is generated in the same city. Independence has its own municipal power and light plant and generates its own current. I do not know that the following is a fact but it is a suspicion of mine that the reason they do not buy current from the Kansas City Power & Light Co. is because they can build their own plant and generate their own current and save money. Those men in Independence are good hard-headed businessmen and they try to get a dollar's worth of current for every dollar they spend.

Let me tell you another thing. There are 41 other cities and towns in the State of Missouri that have their own municipal light plant and that generate their own current. Why? The only reason they do it is because they can do it cheaper than they can get the power from the Power Trust in Missouri. If it is all right for 42 cities and towns in the State of Missouri to generate the current they use and distribute it to their customers, why in the name of all things good is it wrong for all the farmers in all the State of Missouri to have two transmission lines and two generating plants? If it is all right for cities and towns in Missouri to have 42 generating plants why is it wrong for all the farmers in that great State to have two such plants?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT] does not seem to know that the power business is a public business and that the clothing business is a private business. His argument is the same old "stuff" we heard when they were fighting against the creation of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. If the Government was producing the wool that the clothes were made out of, we would have a case in point, but the Government does not.

Mr. RANKIN. We also heard the same stuff when they were fighting the development of the Columbia River. If we had not succeeded in those two enterprises the American people today would be paying from one to three billion dollars more for their electricity than they are paying.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. If the private power companies in the State of Missouri would sign a contract to sell to REA wholesale at 6 mills per kilowatt-hour and deliver the current to the points of need for a period of 20 years, we would not need the lines and we would not need the generating plants, but they will not do it. They have not done it, and they are not going to do it.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. TACKETT. Does the gentleman think that the REA's in Missouri are building those cooperative generating plants down there?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. They will be, if they get the money.

Mr. TACKETT. Does the gentleman not know that the Federal Government, through the guise of the Southwestern Power Administration, will build them?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. And every dollar of the money will be repaid into the Federal Treasury with interest, so whose business is it?

Mr. TACKETT. Does the gentleman not know that it is not going to be repaid, as long as SPA takes the produced power and spend the proceeds from the sale there of nationalizing the electric industry? None of the proceeds from the sale of such electricity reaches the United States Treasury. Does the gen-

tleman know anything about what he is talking about?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. The REA is already ahead on its entire schedule of payment and will pay for these lines and plants with interest. I do not know what the gentleman considers I know or I do not know, and I am not worried about his consideration along that line.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. As a matter of fact, is not the gentleman from Arkansas, and the rest of the gentlemen, for that matter, talking about an entirely different contract? We started out talking about a contract between the power companies and the Southwestern Power Administration to use the power that is being generated by the Southwestern Power Administration. The gentleman from Arkansas is discussing a contract that somebody has with some local cooperative, or maybe it is a transmission cooperative down in the State of Oklahoma. We are talking about an entirely different contract; and when he is talking about whether or not it will be paid back, it will all be paid back.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I would like to point out to the gentleman that I think the people in your State ought to build your generating plants yourselves. Why do you have to come and ask the Federal Government to do such work; if you need the power, build your own plants. Up in my State of Pennsylvania last year in the city of Warren, Pa., in my district, the Penelec Co. built a \$14,000,000 generating plant. They did not ask the State to help, and they did not ask the Federal Government to help. The need for power was evident. The plant was built. They put their own cash on the barrel head to do the job to furnish the power needed in the area.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. The Government put up the cash to build the White River Dam as a flood-control and generating project, and its cost will be repaid from the sale of current generated; and we have as much right to that current as the Arkansas Power & Light Co. has.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri be permitted to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I wish to point out some facts to the gentleman in regard to the Arkansas Power & Light Co. There was never before gathered in America such a group of licensed burglars working for the Wall Street monopoly which owns the company as the group running the Arkansas Power & Light Co. for Electric Bond & Share. If the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT] will read the hearings of the subcommittee for the Department of Interior of the House Appropriations Committee of which I was a member, I believe it was back in March of 1946 for fiscal year 1947, he will see ample justification for the statement that I make. The greatest thing that ever happened in the five great States of the Southwest has been the creation of the Southwestern Power Administration.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I thank the gentleman. I agree with him 100 percent.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I agree with what the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] has said. What I am afraid of is this: I am afraid of these attempts to turn that power over to the power trust, that is the Electric Bond & Share, not the Arkansas Power & Light Co., not the Texas Power & Light Co., not the Louisiana Power & Light Co., not the Mississippi Power & Light Co.; it is the Electric Bond & Share, a holding company which is really owned in Wall Street, New York. And what I am afraid of is that they will bleed those people for this power, that is public power to begin with, and that the consumers should get at the lowest possible rate. I have been in this fight a long time. In 1933 I along with Senator NORRIS introduced a bill and fought it through to create the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER] be permitted to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. I led the drive here for rural electrification when Arkansas had 1.2 percent of her farms electrified. If we had lost that fight, there would not have been an electric light in the average home in Arkansas for the next 40 years. This is not a question of the Government going into private business; the power business is a public business. Our water power is public property, and we do not intend for it to be taken over and monopolized by the Power Trust.

Mr. ROONEY. If the gentleman from Missouri will yield to me further, I wonder if the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr.

TACKETT] has ever heard of the acquisitions of properties by Ham Moses' Arkansas Power and Light in the State of Arkansas, where properties were acquired at one price and put on their books at a phony price which was millions and millions of dollars over the price at which they were actually acquired? The facts in regard to this may be found beginning at page 379 of part 3 of the hearings on the 1947 Interior appropriations bill.

I wonder if the gentleman from Arkansas knows that the Arkansas Power & Light Co. is well represented in every golf club in the State of Arkansas. Ham's boys are in every Chamber of Commerce, Lions Club, Kiwanis, and everything else. In a great number of instances the cost of dues and contributions is added to the farmers' electric bills. They sell the bill of goods that good old Arkansas Power & Light belongs to Arkansas, not Wall Street, New York, the real owner. In the interest of their alma mater, Electric Bond & Share, they have opposed the building of every dam and transmission line in the Southwest. Very few members from the State of Arkansas do not hear from the various organizations in which the Arkansas Power & Light is so well represented and from the newspapers in every town in which the Arkansas Power & Light advertises.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. The gentleman from New York is interested in Arkansas, and I am glad he is, and cheaper rates, but I just want to ask him what he is doing to get cheaper rates in New York and to clean out the crookedness in that State?

Mr. ROONEY. We are not as fortunate in New York in getting cheap power rates as the people are in the gentleman's State. I have always supported public power and the best interests of the people of Arkansas, as the gentleman well knows, from my service with him, in the subcommittee on Interior Department appropriations. There is no good reason why, if in my State we have to pay 7 and 8 times as much for electric power, I should take it out on the good people of the State of Arkansas.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I just want to say to my distinguished friend from New York, too, that there is no reason why the taxpayers of Pennsylvania should put their money up to build power plants all over the United States.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, while some of these gentlemen are taking credit for having brought electricity to the rural areas of Arkansas, I should like to take some credit for assisting to electrify rural Arkansas. A glance at the legislative record of 1937 within the State of Arkansas will reveal that BOYD TACKETT voted to bring rural electrification to the State of Arkansas when it was not nearly so popular as now. I have never yet failed to vote at every possible opportunity for rural electrification, and I shall

never vote against rural electrification. But I want to tell you who are hollering long and loud for public power to replace the rural electrification program and to allow the rural electrification system to be abolished by the greatest monopoly that was ever known to man, that you can talk about electric power monopolies all you like, but there is no greater or more drastic monopoly than a Government monopoly, and all of you know that. You public power advocates condemn monopolies on one hand while creating on the other hand the most dangerous monopoly known to man—a great Government monopoly.

When a boy on the farm, like my neighboring boyhood friends, I longed for the day when I could live in the small town nearby that I might enjoy some of the comforts and entitlements of life principally afforded by electric service. However, it is now possible to visualize a near future when the people of the metropolitan areas will be living for that day when it will be possible for them to move to and reside within the wide open rural spaces where they will at the same time be afforded equal comforts of life to those within the metropolitan areas.

Hamstring the rural electrification program? No. I would do absolutely nothing detrimental to this great enterprise and will always use every honorable means at my command to further this most meritorious project. I am a devout advocate of rural electrification, and I am just as anxious as any person in this country to see every farm within the United States electrified at the earliest possible date.

The REA and the SPA are distinct and separate programs, and the SPA has contributed nothing to advance or promote the high standards of rural electrification. The rural electrification program is a successful, meritorious, free, and independent organization—the respective electric cooperatives being owned, controlled, governed, and operated by and for the membership, with justifiable authority under our American way of life to freely engage in bringing electric service to the rural areas of our country.

The Southwestern Power Administration, on the other hand, is an agency of the Federal Government under the Department of the Interior with limited congressional authority to pool power and energy produced from Government multiple-purpose dams and distribute such power and energy as provided by law at rates to be approved by the Federal Power Commission.

I wholeheartedly concur in the statements of one of my fellow colleagues that rural electrification has been a long and hard struggle; that the remaining unserved 33 percent of rural Arkansas should be electrified under the splendid rural electrification program without delay; and that rural electrification is just now coming into full fruition. However, these facts do not in anywise justify the activities of the SPA. It cannot be contended that the SPA should be credited with having electrified 67 percent of the rural areas within the State of Arkansas, but, to the contrary, these

achievements have been realized under the authority granted by the Rural Electrification Act of 1936. It is not necessary to allow the Department of the Interior, through the Southwestern Power Administration, to nationalize, federalize, and socialize the rural electric cooperatives in order to bring electricity to the remaining 33 percent of the unserved rural area of our State.

Yes; the rural electric cooperatives should be and are authorized and entitled to construct electric-generating units and transmission lines that the cheapest possible electric energy may be made available to the membership in accordance with good business principles under our system of free enterprise. However, I insist that the Southwestern Power Administration is not justifiably entitled to similar authorizations if we are to maintain our principles of democracy, assist our rural electrification program, and uphold our belief in private ownership.

To allow the Federal Government, through its SPA agency, to establish and dictate policies for the rural electric cooperatives, and to use, control, and receive all benefits from electric generating and transmission facilities constructed by the cooperatives is nothing less than an authorization to federalize the rural electric cooperatives, permit the SPA to expand its legal jurisdiction, and place the Government in direct competition with its citizens.

Those proposing to place the Government into the power field as a competitor in order to assure cheaper energy than the electric cooperatives and others engaged in the power industry can produce could just as successfully contend that we should have Government-owned parallel and duplicating railway and street-car tracks; airplane, boat, bus, and truck routes; telephone and telegraph lines; and radio and television channels. Petroleum, gas, and coal could be produced cheaper by the Government. No doubt all of these businesses are in the plans of those seeking to use the Government as a competitor to free enterprise. The ultimate results of such a plan can only mean Government operation and eventual ownership.

The rural electric cooperatives within the Southwest have today three sources of electricity:

First. Government flood-control dams over transmission lines owned by the Government, private companies, or those that the cooperatives build, own and operate themselves;

Second. Private power companies;

Third. Electric-generating plants that the cooperatives build, own, and operate themselves.

Right now the rural cooperatives have the private companies and the Federal Government SPA agency right where they should want them. Both are doing everything possible to do business with the cooperatives. The Southwestern Power Administration and the private companies are competing for the cooperatives' business, and they fully realize the possibility of the cooperatives' building their own steam-power units and trans-

mission lines should the electric rates not be sufficiently low to make justifiable such action on behalf of their membership. As long as this situation prevails it is the rural electric cooperatives within the Southwest that stand to benefit. They have their freedom of choice—the American way.

Once, however, these cooperatives lose their advantage by negotiating a long-term contract, permitting themselves to be tied irrevocably to the apron strings of the SPA for a period of 40 years, the opportunity to buy electricity upon a competitive market is gone and the right to produce and transmit electricity by means of their own facilities has vanished.

SPA is not in the power field with the rural cooperatives and others engaged in the power industry with my good graces. TVA was established not only for flood control and navigation but as a "yardstick" of electric costs for regulating private-power companies. The Public Service Commission in my State of Arkansas, as well as the Federal Power Commission, regulates the involved electric rates. The SPA must sell electricity from the Government flood-control dams at rates approved by the Federal Power Commission. The SPA renders only a power marketing service. The Corps of Engineers build and operate the flood-control dams, and could distribute the electricity from that source to the rural electric cooperatives and others engaged in the power industry over transmission lines built by the engineers, the private companies, or the cooperatives at a great savings to the taxpayers. Were the SPA completely out of the power field the rural electric cooperatives could still obtain electricity from the Government flood-control dams over transmission lines owned by the Government, the private companies, or those that the cooperatives build, own, and operate themselves. Alternative sources would come from private power companies or from electric-generating plants that the cooperatives build, own, operate themselves, and tie in with the Federal power projects.

If the rural electric cooperative membership throughout this country could in some manner be given the true picture of the situation at hand, it would take no action by Congress to preclude the federalization efforts now being made through the SPA plan. A great majority of the people are aware of the Federal Government gradually encroaching more and more upon the lives, happiness, and freedom of the American people. My people do not want Federal regimentation; they will not stand for it; and so long as I am a Member of Congress I shall do all in my power to keep it from being forced upon them.

I hold no brief for the private electric utilities; recognize them as monopolies requiring strict Federal regulation and supervision; but I feel that all water, telephone, electric, fuel, and like utilities have a definite place in our economic picture, and should not be permitted to be abolished by the competition of the Federal Government. No monopoly

could ever exist so dangerous and devastating to democracy as a Federal Government monopoly.

However, you may be assured that I do hold a brief, and a strong one, for the American system of free enterprise upon which this Nation was founded and has become the greatest upon the face of this earth. It alarms me and it should concern all of us tremendously when we see the Federal Government taking steps toward nationalization, which would result eventually in a completely socialized state. The founders of American democracy never intended that we employ such a system. The great strength of America today lies in the fact that our individuals and industries have been encouraged and inspired by the right of free enterprise—the right to earn a legitimate, honest dollar without working in direct competition with the Federal Government, or without being taken over, lock, stock, and barrel, by the Federal Government.

The Southwestern Power Administration activities are of far-reaching significance—going beyond the electric-power field—going into the very heart of our right for free enterprise which was guaranteed to each and every one of us by the pioneers who built our Nation and our Government. I, for one, want to preserve that right, and the future rights of our children to which they are justly entitled by American democracy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT] never touched side, edge, or bottom of the real issue before us.

The power business is a public business. The water power of this Nation already belongs to the Federal Government. That was decided by the Supreme Court of the United States in both the Ashwander case and the Appalachian Power case.

It was 17 years ago that we had this same fight on the floor of the House. They were trying to force us to turn the power generated in the Tennessee River over to the private power interests. If we had done that, and had turned the power on the Columbia River over to them, the average householder today would be paying from 15 to 25 cents a kilowatt-hour for his electricity, and the average farmer would not have seen an electric light in his home during this generation.

He criticizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY]. We have tried for years to develop the St. Lawrence to give them a yardstick which would probably save the people of New York State \$150,000,000 a year on their light and power bills.

The gentleman from Arkansas confuses the issue when he attempts to talk about private business being owned by the Government. Why, the clothing business is a private business, but the power business is a public business. Why? Because electricity has become a necessity of our modern life. It has to be handled by a monopoly and the water

power already belongs to the Federal Government. It is public power to begin with, and that applies to the energy generated by the Southwest Power Administration.

So we are dealing here with a public business. As the result of the battle that we have carried on for the last 17 years, we have managed to reduce power rates to the American people, while prices of everything else has been increasing. If it had not been for these yardsticks, such as the TVA, you would not only be paying the rate you are paying now in other areas, but you would be paying twice or three times as much. The American people would be paying from two to three, and probably four, billion dollars a year more for their electricity than they are now paying. In Arkansas they had 1.2 percent of their farms electrified before 1934. Today they have more than 70 percent. Where did it come from? It came through the REA. That is where it came from.

I remember the battle I had here in 1938 to secure the first \$100,000,000 for rural electrification. I just won by seven votes. If the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT] had been here, I probably would have won by only six votes. That was when the REA really began to move forward.

Now, do not forget this: There are 33,000,000 residential power consumers in this country; people who turn on electric switches every day and every night. They are not willing to be robbed and plundered by the power trust in order to gratify the cupidity of a group of monopolists in Wall Street. There are 66,000,000 voters in this country that are not going to sit idly by, even in Arkansas or in Texas—they are not going to sit by, and see this monopoly overcharge them with rates that are outrageously unreasonable.

Suppose you paid as much for electricity as you do for your telephone. The telephone trust has a complete monopoly. If you paid as much for electricity as you pay for your telephone, you would probably have not more than one light in each room—if that. I put a telephone in my office at home. I paid more for that telephone, even if I never picked up the receiver, than I paid for both gas and electricity in my home. I pay more for my telephone in Washington than I pay for both gas and electricity in my apartment. If it were not for these public-power systems, such as they have in Columbus, Ohio, Springfield, Ill., Lansing, Mich., and Austin, Tex., and these public-power systems that we have along these streams such as the Tennessee and the Columbia, to keep this monopoly from getting its hands on the water power of the Nation; if it were not for that you would be paying 15 to 25 cents per kilowatt-hour, and the average farmer in this country probably would not have seen electricity in his home for the next 40 years.

I have no apology to make to the gentleman from Arkansas, I have no apology to make to the Electric Bond & Share Co., and I have no apology to make to anyone else for my fight to see that

the American people get the benefit of the greatest wealth in America, outside of the soil upon which we live, that is the water power in our navigable streams and their tributaries.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of the Bonneville transmission system and of marketing electric power and energy, \$5,000,000.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: On page 220, line 9, strike out "\$5,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$4,500,000."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, in the fiscal year 1950, we allowed \$4,000,000 for operation and maintenance of the Bonneville power transmission system. Dr. Raver, the Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration, appeared before the committee to justify his 1951 request of \$5,250,000. While he was testifying he told the committee how well they had been able to operate and maintain the Bonneville power system with the \$4,000,000 which we had appropriated last year; and he said that everyone who was hired under this item had done a wonderful job. I asked Dr. Raver, then, if he did not think the Congress should have a little credit for holding the appropriation down to \$4,000,000. They had asked for considerably more, but the committee did not see fit to give it to them. Dr. Raver, in answer to my question, said: "Yes," that he thought the Congress should have some credit and that the committee should have some credit for holding this appropriation down to \$4,000,000; nevertheless, he asked for \$5,250,000 in this appropriation bill. The committee reduced that to \$5,000,000.

The purpose of my amendment is to reduce the amount further to \$4,500,000. It is true they have more responsibilities this year than last, but not to the extent of 25 percent. This will give them better than a 10-percent increase for operation and maintenance, and I think it is only fair and just that they be held down to \$4,500,000, for certainly we need to save a few million here and there in a lot of places.

The amendment is very reasonable and should be adopted by all means.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I invite the Committee's attention to the fact that the original estimate submitted by the Bureau of the Budget was \$5,250,000 for operation and maintenance of the Bonneville Power Administration. Our subcommittee in its judgment saw fit to cut this item by a quarter of a million dollars, leaving the total amount available for operation and maintenance \$5,000,000.

I believe it is generally agreed that the Bonneville Power Administration, under the able direction of Dr. Paul Raver, is

one of the more efficient, if not the most efficient, of the agencies and bureaus within the Department of the Interior. That great organization has been operated in a businesslike manner. The Bonneville Power Administration will turn into the Treasury during the coming fiscal year approximately \$33,000,000 in revenue. During the current fiscal year, that is, fiscal 1950, the total expenditures that have been approved by the Congress for construction, operation, and maintenance, aggregate some \$46,000,000. For the coming fiscal year our subcommittee has approved the total sum of \$63,250,000, an increase of some \$22,000,000. We are engaged in a tremendous expansion program, and I believe the cut we have already made is more than adequate. Certainly it is not much of a reward to a great organization that is doing an efficient job to cripple it with a limitation of funds. As we expand the transmission lines, in keeping with the new dams that will be coming into operation, it is most essential that sufficient funds be provided to operate that great organization in an efficient manner.

I invite the Committee's attention to the fact that in 1952 the great McNary Dam will come into operation on the Columbia River, as well as the Hungry Horse project in northwestern Montana. This will add to the responsibilities of the Bonneville Power Administration. It is only a businesslike protection of the taxpayers' investment to expand the staff that will assume these added responsibilities.

I think the committee has done a prudent thing in trimming this expenditure somewhat. However, I do not think any further cut would be wise. I hope the Committee will vote the gentleman's amendment down.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as many of you gentlemen know, my district includes the Bonneville project on the Oregon side. I have had quite a bit to do with that undertaking while I have been a Member of Congress. I have served on the Public Works Committee which authorized all these various projects throughout the United States, including Bonneville.

With reference to this particular project, it must be conceded by those who are familiar with what is being done on the Columbia River that the Bonneville Administration through Dr. Raver is doing a good job. As a matter of fact, it is the one operation in the United States where Uncle Sam is getting back dollar for dollar all of the money he has put in by way of investment. The pay-out schedule on Bonneville is 10 years ahead of the program. In other words, if Bonneville continues this pay-out schedule it is making at the present time, the Federal Government will be paid back all of its investment 10 years ahead of the time originally prescribed for amortization.

The Bonneville Administration, as has been said and as admitted by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], has increased responsibilities by reason of

the heavy increased development of hydroelectric power in that area. The State of Oregon has increased in population 59 percent in the last 10 years. It holds the lead in the United States of all States for percentage increase in population, which means that we have an increased demand for hydroelectric power and services of all sorts from public utilities. As a result, the Bonneville Power Administration has an increased burden. Every kilowatt of power that is produced at Bonneville is being sold at market price and those funds are going back into the Federal Treasury. As a result, it is not only paying out the Federal investment, but it is helping to build up the economy of the great Northwest where apparently so many of our people from other States want to make their permanent homes.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANGELL. I yield to my friend the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I can understand why the gentleman opposes this amendment. I know he is greatly interested in the development of his State. The gentleman also knows that the Eightieth Congress treated the Bonneville Power Administration very generously. I was chairman of the committee that gave them more money than they ever had before in history. We do not want to stop that development. However, they had only \$4,000,000 last year, which is a lot of money for administration and operation. If my amendment is adopted, we will be giving them \$500,000 more this year than they had last year.

Mr. ANGELL. May I say to the gentleman that I realize he has done an excellent job. He has been very kind, indeed, to Bonneville. While he served on this great committee he visited our area a number of times, he has gone over these projects, and is perhaps as well informed on them as any man who does not live in the area. But the fact is, we have increased responsibilities so far as Bonneville is concerned which requires more money for operation and maintenance in order to maintain the efficient service the agency is rendering the people of the Pacific Northwest. Many new generators are coming in. There is the Grand Coulee project, which has increased generating capacity. It will not be very long before the McNary Dam power will be brought in, then Hungry Horse, Albany Falls, and others. In the meantime Bonneville has to provide the transmission facilities to take care of this increased load. Every kilowatt-hour that is produced is being sold. We are not wasting a single kilowatt. As a matter of fact, we have gone 10 percent plus above the rated generating capacity of those projects to supply needed power, and even then we are not able to supply the hydroelectricity to the industries and the farmers that need the power in the area. There is a great dearth of power in the area. The committee already has cut \$250,000 below the budget estimate. If we cut the item an additional \$500,000, as this amendment will do, it means that you

are just going to curtail the activities of one great agency of this Federal Government, among the few, which is paying its way and doing a good job in serving a fast-growing area. I think it would be a grave mistake, and I think the gentleman from Iowa himself will realize, after the years have gone by, that it will be a mistake if we curtail these activities of this efficient Federal agency.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HOLMES. I think it is opportune here to express the point that the Hanford Engineering Works is in the Pacific Northwest, in the central part of the State of Washington, which, in turn, is consuming a tremendous amount of power from the services of the Bonneville Power Administration.

Mr. ANGELL. The gentleman's observation is true. If it were not for the Bonneville Power Administration, that great atomic energy undertaking at Hanford in Washington could not be carried forward. It has performed an outstanding service in our national defense program.

It seems that not a year can pass without some sort of an attack being made on the Bonneville Power Administration. This year, as in many years past, the attack is on their appropriations requests, which, of course, is the most vulnerable spot of any Federal agency. It does not seem to make any difference that the management of this agency has constantly demonstrated that their operations are on a par with the best private operations in the country, that they not only meet but exceed statutory requirements as regards pay-out, or that the Administrator is fully aware of the wise use of the money appropriated to him. No; no matter what degree of efficiency is demonstrated by this agency, they can still expect to be attacked whenever they ask for appropriations to carry on the duties imposed upon them by law. This year the attack is centered on appropriations for operation and maintenance. It is the most vulnerable spot of any type of enterprise, public or private.

It is in this part of the Bonneville activity where the most stringent requirements have always been imposed by Congress and which has caused the most difficulty to the Bonneville Administrator.

Funds for operation and maintenance for the Bonneville Power Administration have been annually set up in the appropriation bill as a limitation within the total funds appropriated. Congress, in its wisdom, feels that such limitations are necessary in order to control the activities of the Federal power agencies. Personally, I am not in sympathy with that view. The record of the Bonneville Power Administration over the past 10 years indicates that its management is certainly of the highest order. You do not have to take my word for it—a copy of Bonneville's annual report can be made available to you upon request. That report will show you that over the

period of its operations to date, this agency has not only met all repayment requirements as set up by law, but shows a comfortable surplus of nearly \$43,000,000 more than the cash appropriation requested this year for capital expenditure. And remember that this financial picture has been compiled from power revenues based on the lowest wholesale power rates in this country. When an Administrator can show such a record, I do not think he needs to be told how far he can be permitted to go in expending funds for any given operation or activity. He knows that if his overhead is too great, he is not going to pay out. He has demonstrated that he knows this important fact, so why hamstring him by limitations that can have no other result except that of forced inefficiency.

I know that at times the Bonneville Administrator has been at his wit's end in trying to determine how to handle the various necessary activities that must be performed in an operation of the magnitude of that encompassed by the Bonneville Power Administration. A few statistics will very quickly indicate why this is so.

I do not intend to burden this body with a long recital of these statistics, but will indicate some figures for 2 years, showing comparisons of Bonneville operations with private operations. In the general debate on this chapter last Friday I discussed Bonneville operations at some length. In 1947, operating expenses of the Bonneville Power Administration were 11.4 percent of operating revenues. A comparable figure for all of the combined class A and B utilities in the United States for that year is 21.8 percent. Also in that year, the operating utilities in the Pacific Northwest used from 18.2 percent to 31.4 percent of their operating revenues for operating expenses and this range covers all of the utilities operating in that area. Let me put this matter on another base. Operating expenses on a basis of mills per kilowatt-hour sold were 0.32 for Bonneville, 3.50 for the combined class A and B utilities in this country, and the range for the Pacific Northwest utilities was 1.3 to 4.11.

Now let us go to 1948. In that year, the operating expenses as a percent of operating revenues were 13.2 percent for Bonneville, 21.4 percent for the combined A and B utilities, and a range of 20.9 percent to 29.2 percent for the Pacific Northwest utilities. On the basis of mills per kilowatt-hour sold, Bonneville's cost was 0.31, the combined A and B utilities 3.55, and the range for the Pacific Northwest utilities 1.54 to 5.66. In all of the foregoing figures, production expenses have been deducted in order to make the figures comparable, since in the private operations production expenses are a very large part of their operating cost.

I would like to cite one other comparison. In 1947, Bonneville's operating expenses as a percent of total electric plant were 3.4 percent as against 14.4 percent for the combined class A and B utilities. In 1948, the comparison was 3.3 percent for Bonneville, and 15.3 percent for the combined A and B utilities. In 1949, Bonneville's percent is still 3.3

percent, but I do not have a comparable figure for the combined A and B utilities.

My colleagues, do you need any further demonstration of the effectiveness of Bonneville's operations? Do you need any further evidence that they have been forced to do a job with lesser tools than any private operation requires, or are you willing to admit that the Bonneville Power Administration operations are far more efficient than the best private operations in this country? It is my opinion that it is a combination of the two. You have not allowed this agency sufficient funds to properly operate and maintain their system, and the fact that they have gotten along as well as they have with the funds available certainly is a tribute to the efficiency of their operations.

There is a saying that one can be penny-wise and pound-foolish. If you gentlemen are sincere in your statements that you want to save money for this country, then you certainly do not want to be accused of being penny-wise and pound-foolish; but I can assure you that that is what you will be if you continue to curtail operation money for this agency. At least, let us be fair and put them on a par with private enterprise, of which we have heard so much in recent years.

I did not intend to burden you with any further statistics, but I will make another comparison which I think is very pertinent. This pertains to administrative and general expenses. In 1947 cost in this category for Bonneville as a percent of operating revenues was 4 percent. For the combined class A and B utilities it was 6.5 percent. For the Pacific Northwest systems it varied from 6 to 9.5 percent. Comparable figures for 1948 are 5 percent for Bonneville, 6.3 percent for the combined A and B utilities, and a range of 6.2 to 9.1 percent for the Pacific Northwest utilities. In 1949 this figure remained at 5 percent for Bonneville. I do not have a comparable figure for the other utilities for that year.

It is my considered opinion that we do not need to impose any type of limitation for operation and maintenance for the Bonneville Power Administration. They have demonstrated that they can do more with a dollar than most private operations in this country. The Bonneville people are proud of their record, and I am absolutely certain that they do not intend to jeopardize that record by any ill-considered use of funds. However, there is such a limitation. There is a specific appropriation for operation and maintenance. If we must have it, then let us make it high enough to permit the Bonneville Administrator to do the job in the way that it should be done. The amount of \$5,000,000 that is in this appropriation for operation and maintenance for this agency will still not bring them up to the comparable expenditure by private utilities, so I ask you to let that figure stand without any further reduction.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that this amendment be voted down so that the operations of the Bonneville Administration may not be curtailed and service to the fast-growing area in the Pacific Northwest be set back. Such a course will penalize the residents of the area.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there is one thing I wish the Members on both sides of the aisle would realize and that is this, that we are not giving the Bonneville Power Administration a dime; we are not giving any of these agencies a quarter. They are going to pay back this money. Now, if you want them to go ahead and construct Bonneville and everything else out of the Northwest, as well as the rest of the power projects in this bill, you should realize that we are not giving any one of them a dime. Sixty-one percent of this money is coming back. They are going to pay it back; in fact, that is one branch of the Government, one department, that pays back. There is a little over \$100,000,000 in this bill to operate other parts of the Department of the Interior—surveys and matters like that.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, there is no Member in the House who has made a more diligent and determined fight for economy in the Congress of the United States than my friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], the proposer of this amendment.

I recognize it is necessary to bring economy to the Government if our Nation is to remain solvent. I honor the gentleman from Iowa for making his fight for economy. I usually support him. At the same time, I think we must be selective in reducing Government expenses, for merely cutting an item may prove false economy rather than wise. There is such a thing as being penny-wise and pound-foolish.

The Bonneville Power Authority operates a great and growing business. Last year it did a business of \$27,881,000, sold that much power and electricity. During the coming year Dr. Raver, the administrator, estimates Bonneville power sales will total \$32,231,000. In other words, the Bonneville Power Administration will increase its electricity sales by more than \$4,000,000 or by more than 15 percent.

Due to this about 15 percent expansion in Bonneville power sales more lines and substations must be operated. This will require more people to supervise its power distribution and more persons and materials to keep its lines in repair and in efficient operation.

Also as these lines and substations grow older they require more repairs and greater sums must be spent on their maintenance. Every businessman knows it usually is cheaper to maintain a machine in good condition than to repair one. To allow machines or power lines to deteriorate is, in my opinion, false economy. We may, if this amendment

carries, save \$500,000 this year, but in future years may, as a result of this attempted saving, be confronted with much larger and more costs in repairs.

Our industrial situation in the Pacific Northwest, by which I mean the States of Oregon and Washington, is rather unusual. We have very little coal. We have no gas and no oil. We are almost solely dependent on hydroelectricity to operate the multitude of machines in our many and varied industries. If our power supply were broken by a transmission line break or a substation closure we have no easy or ready way of restoring the means of driving the machines in our industries. Such breakdowns mean tremendous losses in employment to workers and large extra costs to manufacturers as well as a loss of income-tax revenues to the Government.

Power is of no value unless it is delivered to the places of consumption, and delivered there in abundance and uninterruptedly. Reduction of the item of \$5,000,000, provided in the bill for operation and maintenance of the Bonneville Power Administration, to \$4,507,000 as is proposed by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] is, in my opinion, not wise. I hope his amendment will be rejected. This item has already been reduced below the Budget Bureau's recommendation by \$250,000 in committee. I believe it is poor economy to reduce it any further.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. As a matter of fact, when you boil the whole situation down, you have the power installations that produce the current. What you need this money for is to extend your lines and sell your electricity when it comes from these power-producing plants.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Power is of no value, of course, unless it is delivered to the ultimate consumer, and delivered in an uninterrupted manner.

Mr. JENNINGS. Over a line of wire strung on poles.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Let us keep the record straight. This does not take anything away from the construction.

Mr. MACK of Washington. No; that is correct.

Mr. JENSEN. It takes nothing away from the building of lines or related facilities. It simply reduces by 10 percent the amount to be spent for administration and operation. The facts are that they need no sales force because they have more demand for the power than they have power. We are giving them more for the year that starts July 1 than we did for this year, the fiscal year 1950, by the amount of \$500,000.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Yes; but the lines will carry 10 or 15 percent more current than it has in former years. Bonneville will be a bigger business and naturally the bigger the business the more money needed to operate it.

Mr. JENSEN. That does not make so much difference. You do not have to follow that current along the wire. It gets there without your pushing it along too much.

Mr. MACK of Washington. There are also more substations to maintain and operate.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. It is true, is it not, that the reduction in this allowance will take away money which is provided for the maintenance of these lines which are now carrying heavier loads than they should be required to carry? Last year they had two or three breakdowns due to the overloading of the lines. It threw out of operation many of the industries, practically, in that area. There is an additional expense in the maintenance of the transmission lines. It is true there is no money in this for construction purposes. It is maintenance.

Mr. MACK of Washington. As the lines get older they also require more maintenance.

Mr. ANGELL. That is true.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. Along the line of what the gentleman from Oregon has said, I would remind the House that we had a very, very severe winter last year, and that always has its effect upon the items that have to be maintained in any transmission lines. That is a factor that should be taken into consideration at this time.

Mr. MACK of Washington. The gentleman is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JENSEN) there were—ayes 57, noes 78.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. JENSEN and Mr. JACKSON of Washington.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 74, noes 94.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations of the Bonneville Power Administration shall be available to carry out all the duties imposed upon the Administrator pursuant to law, including personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase (not to exceed 17 of which 12 shall be for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase (not to exceed two) of aircraft; and printing and binding. Appropriations made herein to the Bonneville Power Administration shall be available in one fund, except that the appropriation herein made for operation and maintenance shall be available only for the service of the current fiscal year.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: On page 220, after line 21, add the following new paragraph:

"Not to exceed \$1,000,000 of the funds herein provided for the Bonneville Power Administration shall be available for travel expenses."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. NORRELL. I desire to offer an amendment to amend the force account on page 220, line 21, by inserting a new paragraph. If the gentleman's amendment is considered before my amendment, will my amendment be out of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] seeks to add a new paragraph.

Mr. NORRELL. My amendment will be in order after his amendment is disposed of?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has not seen the gentleman's amendment but would assume it would be offered after the pending amendment is disposed of. The gentleman may offer his amendment after the pending amendment is disposed of.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I ask unanimous consent to revise the remarks I previously made in Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment to reduce the travel item which of course does not appear in the bill, but the information we have been able to obtain from the Department is to the effect that there is \$1,564,175 requested in this bill for travel for the Bonneville Power Administration. The amendment which I have offered reduces that figure to \$1,000,000. The business of the Bonneville Power Administration is mostly within the States of Washington and Oregon. It is difficult to understand how they can even spend \$1,000,000 for travel. Of course, we realize there are some officials of the Bonneville Power Administration who must come to Washington occasionally, especially to testify before the House and Senate, but certainly there is no reason for allowing more than \$1,000,000. We do know that many of the higher officials of the Bonneville Power Administration do travel all over the country making speeches to every kind of organization you could imagine. It is not their business to do that.

The business of the officials of the Bonneville Power Administration is to look after the business of the Bonneville Power Administration and not to run all over this United States and Europe telling the people of America and of the world the virtues of the Bonneville Power Administration.

That is about all there is to it, Mr. Chairman; it is a very modest cut, considering the amount we should allow for such travel expenses, and I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I agree with the gentleman and shall, of course, support his amendment. I note that in this paragraph there is no reference at all to travel, whereas in other sections of the bill we have had specific authority for travel. I wonder if the gentleman would explain why there is not anything under that item in this paragraph?

Mr. JENSEN. I might answer the gentleman by referring him to the criticism of the Interior Department by the chairman of the committee in the report, criticism for the method they used in coming before the committee to justify their appropriations and for many other things that are going on in the Department of the Interior which is not pleasing to any of the members of the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations. So, when the gentleman asks me why certain things in this item did not appear in the bill, the facts are there are just a lot of things that do not appear in this bill because they were not willing to give us the facts that we should have had in order to write a bill and in order to appropriate properly.

Mr. KEATING. In other words, this portion of the bill was written, in substance, down in the Interior Department; is that what I am to understand?

Mr. JENSEN. No; I would not say that; I would say that with the information the committee had the chairman wrote this report and this bill. We did not have enough information to write a bill that could be very specific, as it should have been.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call to the committee's attention the fact that the reason the word "travel" does not appear in the item is because it is contained in the basic Bonneville Act. As I understand it, the words "travel allowance" are included in the appropriation bill only where there is no basic authority for travel allowance. The allowance for this year is \$1,345,024. As the gentleman from Iowa has pointed out, such travel funds for fiscal 1951 will be \$1,564,175. This item was broken down and presented to our subcommittee in connection with the justification. Again, I should like to call to the attention of the committee the fact that there are certain increases that apply to travel generally in all of these items that are being presented this year. As the gentleman knows, last year the House ap-

proved the increased per diem allowance from \$6 a day to \$9. In addition there have been increases in fares. I invite attention to the fact also that the area now covered by the Bonneville Power Administration is expanding very materially. In the pending bill there is a substantial increase for new transmission lines into southern Oregon. Lines are also running from the State of Washington through Idaho over to the Hungry Horse Dam; in other words, this item, I think, is pretty much in keeping with the necessary expenses of this great agency. As I pointed out in my previous statement in connection with the operation and maintenance expenses, the Bonneville Power Administration has done an outstanding and efficient job and it has operated its agency in a businesslike manner.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES. Will the gentleman tell the Committee with respect to the auditing of these accounts and whether there has been any criticism of the manner in which they kept their books and accounts?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. This is the first time I have heard of that.

Mr. REES. I am talking about the Department of the Interior in general.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. There may be some other bureau subject to criticism, but speaking with specific reference to the Bonneville Power Administration I may say that it has been commended for the businesslike way in which it has kept its accounts.

In that connection I call attention to the fact that the Bonneville Power Administration was audited by Arthur Anderson & Co., one of the leading certified public accounting firms in the country and that organization gave it a very clean bill of health. That is a private auditing firm. In addition to that, it is my understanding there has never been any criticism, at least to my knowledge, by the General Accounting Office.

Mr. REES. That may be true with respect to the Bonneville Power Administration, but I have heard some criticism with respect to the manner in which it has kept their books and their accounts and that the General Accounting Office is attempting to work out a system so that we will have some understanding with respect to the manner in which these funds are expended.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The gentleman understands I am directing my statements to a specific amendment that is pending.

Mr. REES. I appreciate that, but I thought the gentleman could enlighten us.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I want to corroborate what the gentleman from Washington says to the effect that the books of the Bonneville Power Administration have been audited by this eastern firm

and I think the Bonneville Power Administration is to be commended for its good work in this respect.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I quite agree with the gentleman. It is the first time that a firm of national reputation has been called in to audit the books.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. May I say to the gentleman from Washington that the whole item of travel of our Federal employees should be investigated. I have no doubt but what this would be a fertile field for examination. However, I do object to the amendment on the basis that I would rather see it departmental-wide, rather than picking on one particular part of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Of course, each subcommittee has the responsibility of reducing or adding to the budget requests. I have no particular inside knowledge of items in other subcommittee hearings, but in this instance we have heard all the testimony. We know the problem, we know the situation and certainly anyone who knows the conditions as exist would have to agree that a million dollars is more than the Bonneville Power Administration should have for travel.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JENSEN) there were—ayes 43, noes 63.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NORRELL: Page 220, after line 21, insert "not to exceed 12 percent of the appropriation for construction herein made for the Bonneville Power Administration shall be available for construction work by force account or on a hired labor basis except in cases of emergencies, local in character, so declared by the Bonneville Power Administrator."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, this only restores existing law; it adds nothing to it. For many years there has been a limitation on the amount of construction money that the Bonneville Power Administration could use itself and thereby not contract out to private enterprise. This merely puts back into the law, which was, I think, inadvertently omitted by the committee, the existing law, and I think there will be no objection to it.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, the committee accepts the amendment.

Mr. JENSEN. I have no objection to the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time briefly to propound an inquiry of the members of the committee. I have been advised and have observed that through either design or inadvertence the funds available for the Oil and Gas Division for the Director and his staff, Department of the Interior, have been practically deleted. The purpose of my taking this time is to inquire of the committee if it was really the intention of the committee in the consideration of this measure to do away with this division which has been in effect an operation and serving the people over a long period of time. If some member of the committee could answer that, I would appreciate it.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. In reply to the gentleman from Arkansas I can state that in the first place this specific activity is not authorized by law. The committee has in effect delegated to the Secretary the authority to expend funds in this area. The committee felt that discretion should be vested in the Secretary of the Interior to let him determine whether or not the expenditure should be made. The funds are made available but the mandatory expenditure of the funds is not required.

Mr. HARRIS. I am advised by the Secretary's office that they are very much in need of this. This is a very vital part of their service. It is rendering a very fine service to the people of the country, and it is badly needed, because without it they are very much at the mercy of certain of the industries who get themselves in a position with cooperative arrangements.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. If the gentleman will refer to page 160 of the report accompanying the omnibus bill he will find the committee has stated the following:

It is noted that the Oil and Gas Division was established after the war to continue certain functions performed by the Petroleum Administration for War. There was a need to have active Government cooperation with the petroleum industry during the period of maldistribution of oil products just after the war, but the committee is cognizant of no such condition or need at present. Therefore, the Oil and Gas Division should be either abolished or substantially reduced. Specialists in the petroleum field can be made a part of the program organization to advise the Secretary on policy and coordination of those matters for which the Department is responsible by law.

May I state as a follow-up that the committee has not taken away the funds for that particular activity. The committee has in effect suggested that this ought to be coordinated and tied in with the work of the Secretary.

Mr. HARRIS. I respectfully submit to the gentleman that this is a very worthy function of the Government. The need for it now seems to be much more apparent than it was even during the war or immediately after the war. The Secretary has only recently submitted to the National Petroleum Council the request to make certain investigations and to

report thereon, on the vitally important subject of the importation of crude oil.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The money has not been taken away from the Secretary.

Mr. HARRIS. The Secretary says different; \$148,000, either indirectly or directly.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. My understanding of legislative procedure is that what I am saying here is making a part of the legislative history of this item. It may be that the Department will want to use this money for some other activity, but that is not the fault of the committee.

Mr. HARRIS. I understand that is not altogether the case, as it is understood by the Department. The Secretary himself has so said, as I understand.

May I ask the gentleman if his committee will, then, as the appropriation bill takes its way through this Congress, if it develops later on through the information that he obtains from the Secretary of the Interior that there is a need for this, give consideration to providing him just such funds as are absolutely needed.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. May I suggest to my friend from Arkansas that the appropriate way to approach this problem is the regular way, that is, to introduce legislation to authorize this activity.

Mr. HARRIS. This matter is authorized, and the Department of the Interior has set it up under Executive order of the President of the United States.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I regret to differ with my friend. It is not authorized by law. It would be subject to a point of order if specifically provided for in this bill. The gentleman is much better off from his own standpoint that it is not included as a separate item. If it were, it would have been subject to a point of order.

Mr. HARRIS. I would suggest that the gentleman look into it a little further in the course of the appropriation bill going through. If it does appear that it is needed, as the bill goes through the other body and then into conference, the gentleman will find that he can perform a very worth-while service.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I think the colloquy that has taken place here provides the basis for a solution to the gentleman's problem.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

For expenses necessary for protection, use, improvement, development, disposal, cadastral surveying, classification, and performance of other functions, as authorized by law in the management of lands and their resources under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, \$6,756,800: *Provided*, That this appropriation may be expended on a reimbursable basis for surveys of lands other than those under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, although I am not going to offer any amendment to increase the appropriation for the Bureau of Land

Management, I feel that our committee in this instance has cut a little too deep.

When we review the committee report in relation to the original President's budget, and the bill as reported out, we find certain items that have been cut too closely for the people's good.

The wise administering of the public lands is important to the whole country, not only from the standpoint of food production, but from that of revenue producing activities such as oil, potassium and other minerals that are developed through private leasing of these lands, timber production and conservation, grazing and selective disposal of lands under the various land laws.

The agency responsible for the management of the lands is the Bureau of Land Management which has been seriously cut in several major activities of its appropriation.

This agency may be likened to a business—it takes money for it to make money. On its limited appropriations it has been turning in Federal revenues amounting to more than \$37,000,000, in other words approximately \$7 return for every \$1 appropriated. But with greatly increased business it needs more help to carry the load. Actually the number of employees has decreased since 1940. It occurred to me that the subcommittee may have lost sight of the above important aspect of the Bureau's work. In our effort to reduce Government expenditure we must not confuse gross expenditures with net expenditures.

Actually this agency has done a good job of increasing efficiency in the last 2 years, more than trebling the output per man. The small number of personnel cannot possibly keep speeding up the job to keep pace with the increasing volume of business. In my own State, Mr. Paul Roach, a land office manager, died in office as a result of overwork.

There must also be additional funds for development of resource programs that are vital to other conservation jobs. I am speaking specifically of the Bureau's need to provide protection of the watersheds on the public domain lands. In the Rio Grande area of my own State this is especially serious. Siltation of lands from neglected watershed areas is a threat to our very livelihood. The public lands contribute much of the silt flowing into Elephant Butte Reservoir. This is rapidly making useless a great reservoir, upon which our irrigation agriculture is based. Siltation also is filling the river channel, necessitating large public investments in flood-control structures. It is not economy to curtail work for watershed management and improvement, neglecting causes of trouble and spreading all our money—millions of dollars—on relief to the distressed situations caused by it.

I sincerely hope that before the bill returns to the House an adjustment may be made, and I strongly urge that the committee will yield in those cases where the appropriation of added funds will actually in effect decrease the net spending through the added revenues returned, and when the final analysis is made that sufficient funds to do at least the mini-

mum essential management job will be appropriated for the Bureau of Land Management.

The Clerk read as follows:

RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

The aggregate of all moneys received after June 30, 1950, as range-improvement fees under the provisions of section 3 of the act of June 28, 1934 (43 U. S. C. 315), and 25 percent of all moneys received after June 30, 1950, under the provisions of section 15 of said act (in addition to all moneys received during the fiscal year 1950 from either of such sources but not yet appropriated), shall be available until expended for construction, purchase, and maintenance of range improvements pursuant to the provisions of sections 3 and 10 of said act.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph appearing on page 222, lines 18 through 25, and page 223, lines 1 through 3, which is as follows:

RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

The aggregate of all moneys received after June 30, 1950, as range-improvement fees under the provisions of section 3 of the Act of June 28, 1934 (43 U. S. C. 315) and 25 percent of all moneys received after June 30, 1950, under the provisions of section 15 of said Act (in addition to all moneys received during the fiscal year 1950 from either of such sources but not yet appropriated), shall be available until expended for construction, purchase, and maintenance of range improvements pursuant to the provisions of sections 3 and 10 of said Act.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman from Iowa intends to make points of order to subsequent items relating to the same subject matter, namely, the Bureau of Land Management. Would it be in order for the gentleman from Iowa to submit the various points of order dealing with the same subject matter and that they be considered in bloc; and also, is it in order for me to offer an amendment which will make the appropriations on an annual basis in lieu of the language to be stricken on the points of order?

The CHAIRMAN. That can be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I have the following points of order to make.

I make a point of order against the language on page 223, lines 4 through 12, which language is as follows:

PAYMENTS TO STATES (PROCEEDS OF SALES)

Five percent of the net proceeds of sales of public lands and materials from public lands received after June 30, 1950 (in addition to 5 percent of all moneys received prior to June 30, 1950, as net proceeds of sales of public lands and materials from public lands but not yet appropriated), shall be available for payment to the States in which such lands are situated for the purpose of education or of making public roads and improvements.

I make a point of order against the language on page 223, lines 13 through 24, which language is as follows:

PAYMENT TO OKLAHOMA

Thirty-seven and one-half percent of the royalties received after June 30, 1950 (in addition to 37½ percent of all royalties re-

ceived during the fiscal year 1950 but not yet appropriated), from the south half of Red River in Oklahoma under the provisions of the joint resolution of June 12, 1926 (44 Stat. 740), shall be available for payment to the State of Oklahoma in lieu of all State and local taxes upon tribal funds accruing under said act, to be expended by the State in the same manner as if received under section 35 of the act approved February 25, 1920 (30 U. S. C. 191).

I make a point of order against the language on page 224, line 1 through 8, which language is as follows:

LEASING OF GRAZING LANDS

The aggregate of all moneys received after June 30, 1950 (in addition to all moneys received during the fiscal year 1950 but not yet appropriated), from grazing fees for State, county, or privately owned lands leased in accordance with the provisions of the act of June 23, 1938 (43 U. S. C. 315m-4), shall be available until expended for leasing of such lands.

I make a point of order against the language on page 224, lines 9 through 16, which language is as follows:

PAYMENTS TO STATES (GRAZING FEES)

Thirty-three and one-third percent of all grazing fees received after June 30, 1950, from each grazing district on Indian lands ceded to the United States for disposition under the public-lands laws, shall be available for payment to the State in which said lands are situated, in accordance with the provisions of section 11 of the act of June 23, 1934, as amended (43 U. S. C. 315j).

Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the language I have indicated, in each instance, has the effect of making appropriations on a permanent basis, which goes beyond the scope of the bill and also constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill, and, therefore, is not in order under the rules of the House.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I concede the points of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the points of order made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JACKSON of Washington: On page 222, after line 17 insert the following:

"RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

"For construction, purchase, and maintenance of range improvements pursuant to the provisions of sections 3 and 10 of the act of June 23, 1934, as amended (43 U. S. C. 315), sums equal to the aggregate of all moneys received as range improvement fees under section 3 of said act and of 25 percent of all moneys received under section 15 of said act during the current and prior fiscal years but not yet appropriated, to remain available until expended.

"PAYMENTS TO STATES (PROCEEDS OF SALES)

"For payment to the several States of 5 percent of the net proceeds of sales of public lands lying within their limits, for the purpose of education or of making public roads and improvements, sums equal to the aggregate of receipts covered into the Treasury in accordance with section 4 of the act of June 26, 1934 (31 U. S. C. 725c), during the current and prior fiscal years but not yet appropriated.

"PAYMENT TO OKLAHOMA

"For payment to the State of Oklahoma in lieu of all State and local taxes upon tribal

funds accruing under the provisions of the joint resolution of June 12, 1926 (44 Stat. 740), to be expended by the State in the same manner as if received under section 35 of the act approved February 25, 1920 (30 U. S. C. 191), sums equal to 37½ percent of the royalties received during the current and prior fiscal years (but not yet appropriated) from the south half of Red River in Oklahoma under the provisions of said joint resolution of June 12, 1926.

"LEASING OF GRAZING LANDS

"For leasing State, county, or privately owned lands in accordance with the provisions of the act of June 23, 1938 (43 U. S. C. 315m-1), sums equal to the aggregate of receipts covered into the Treasury in accordance with the act of June 23, 1938 (43 U. S. C. 315m-4), during the current and prior fiscal years but not yet appropriated.

"PAYMENTS TO STATES (GRAZING FEES)

"Sums not in excess of 33½ percent of all grazing fees received during the current and prior fiscal years (but not yet appropriated) from each grazing district on Indian lands ceded to the United States for disposition under the public-land laws, to be paid to the State in which said lands are situated, in accordance with the provisions of section 11 of the act of June 23, 1934, as amended (43 U. S. C. 315j)."

Mr. JACKSON of Washington (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. JENSEN. Reserving the right to object, this simply reasserts existing language?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. This has the effect of placing these items on an annual basis, instead of on a permanent basis, and there is no other change.

Mr. TABER. It is the same language that was used last year?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Whether it is exactly the same language, I cannot say for sure, but the effect is to carry it as heretofore; that is, on an annual basis. That is the only change. The net effect is to continue it as heretofore. There is no change in the substance.

Mr. JENSEN. Do I understand that in the amendment the gentleman has just offered there is no additional authority given to any officer of the Department of the Interior?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. That is correct.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to have the amendment read.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The Clerk will read the amendment.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. In reading the last paragraph, I understood the Clerk to read "33½." I understand the previous language was "33½."

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the "33½" be changed to read "33¼."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. May I inquire of the gentleman from Washington—I have already propounded the question once, and I did not get a satisfactory answer—in the language which is proposed now, there is some new language which is not in the fiscal 1950 bill? Is that a fact?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. To be completely frank and honest with the gentleman, I have not compared the language with the 1950 bill, but I want to assure the gentleman that the purpose of offering this is not to change the substance in any way of the language heretofore carried in the 1950 bill. Of necessity we have relied on our technicians to prepare this in keeping with the general coverage of the 1950 appropriation bill.

Mr. JENSEN. Was this change of language which the gentleman has just submitted written by the Department of the Interior or by our own staff?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. This was prepared by our own committee clerk.

Mr. JENSEN. I have no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. This is not entirely familiar to me and I should like to ask the gentleman what would happen if we did not adopt the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. As I understand, there is substantive law which provides that these receipts shall go into specific funds in the Treasury, that under the basic law heretofore passed by the Congress certain people are entitled to these receipts. I have offered these amendments simply in order to accommodate the point of order offered by the gentleman from Iowa. They introduce no new substance into the bill. Therefore, nothing will be accomplished by a failure to adopt these amendments. In fact, it will simply confuse the situation. There will be no savings by not agreeing to the amendments which we are offering in lieu of the matter stricken by the points of order.

Mr. KEATING. In other words, to put it another way, if we did not adopt the amendments offered by the gentleman from Washington, it would not result in these sums being gathered into the United States Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Oh, no. It is my understanding that they are primarily funds allocated for a specific purpose and they do not go into the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury. They would not go into the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury if the amendment that I have offered in lieu of the language stricken out on the point of order were voted down.

Mr. KEATING. And that is because of legislation heretofore enacted.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. That is correct.

Mr. DEWART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. DEWART. I wish to say that these amendments carry out the purpose of the Nicholson report, which was the result of a study under the direction of the President relating to the management and handling of public land. That report was made 2 or 3 years ago to the Secretary of the Interior. It contains certain recommendations in regard to the disposition of funds and the management of public lands, and these provisions in this bill carry out those recommendations of the so-called Nicholson report.

Mr. Chairman, we are at this time taking a second look at the Appropriations Committee report. Before we put the final seal of approval upon it, we must be sure that in our attempt to place the accent on economy, we have not actually increased the net Government expense through the curtailment of money making and money saving activities.

Certain items of this nature are found in the program of the Bureau of Land Management, a program with which I am especially familiar. The items for land classification, for grazing administration and for range and watershed improvement are of great importance to the West as well as to potential users of the public domain wherever they may reside.

Land classification activities have made possible a realistic program for land use and land rehabilitation of abused public lands. Classification enables the Bureau to dispose of those isolated tracts of Federal land where productive management is not practical. It discloses areas where erosion may cause excessive siltation of water storage facilities, an extremely important consideration at this time when we are spending so much money for the construction of multipurpose dams and reservoirs on western rivers. All of this work, which saves money and reduces the cost of government, should be continued with adequate land classification personnel.

The committee has made reductions in the request for Grazing Administration, an item which I feel should be restored both in the interests of proper administration of the public domain and in the interests of the users of this land. This item is necessary to carry out the full program of the Taylor Grazing Act, which includes, as you will recall, five principal purposes: First, to stop injury to the public grazing lands by preventing overgrazing and soil deterioration; second, to provide for their orderly use, improvement, and development; third, to effect an equitable apportionment of the grazing privileges among the owners of base properties outside of the districts and to issue grazing licenses, permits or leases in accordance with these determinations; fourth, to provide adequate supervision in order to insure proper use and to prevent trespass use; and fifth, to stabilize the livestock industry dependent upon the public range.

The public domain is a great resource, of tremendous value to all the people of our Nation. It is an essential part of our economy in the West. It is in the interests of all of us that it be properly managed, maintained, and used to the fullest

advantage, and the comparatively small sums required to achieve these purposes are money well spent.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this administration may well be proud of the job it conceives in the field of management—a job which the President's budget fully reflected this year. Many cuts have been made in this budget where there was evidence that these cuts could be made without danger to the Nation's economy.

At the same time the President's budget recommended increases in appropriations to a few agencies whose essential workload had increased greatly and whose operating load had demonstrated that they had wisely managed the funds allotted to them. An outstanding example is the Bureau of Land Management in the Department of the Interior. This agency, as you know, is responsible for the management of the public domain lands. The workload of this agency through applications of individuals, small businessmen, and large industrialists has more than doubled, yet the number of persons available to handle these applications has decreased. The Bureau has cut corners in administration to the point that they have trebled the output per worker in the past 2 years. Still the individuals and businesses wanting to develop and use the public lands pour in with applications. With increased appropriations it had hoped to permit an even better program for use of the public domain. Curtailment of funds from the President's budget will slow down the work and cause a terrific load to be placed on the Bureau of Land Management's meager staff.

In my own State of California I have observed the job land office personnel are doing. They are carrying too heavy a load and that load is increasing as applications for public land use increase. The item of \$884,210 in contrast to the requested amount of \$1,119,600 provides only for present operation in leasing and disposal of lands and mineral resources. In California and other States the Bureau of Land Management has received thousands of applications from disabled and other veterans of World War II for desert homesites. These applications cannot be handled promptly in spite of the recognized personal urgency of such cases without added appropriations.

Increased appropriations to the land management functions of the Bureau of Land Management will actually result in a net decrease in Federal costs, since last year this agency collected \$7 for every \$1 spent. Added funds will, similarly, more than pay for themselves.

In my considered judgment, the original estimate of \$9,750,000 in the President's budget for the Bureau of Land Management is an amount well justified on the basis of returns. Furthermore, Bureau officials have demonstrated that they know how to spend the Government

money appropriated with the same care that would be exercised if it were their own.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at that point in the Record where debate was concluded on the point of order first offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING], which was subsequently withdrawn, and on which the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] spoke.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE SERVICES

For expenses, necessary to provide health, education, and welfare services for Indians, either directly or in cooperation with States and other organizations, including payment (in advance or from date of admission) of care, tuition, assistance, and other expenses of Indians in boarding homes, institutions, or schools; grants and other assistance to needy Indians; maintenance of law and order, and payment of rewards for information or evidence concerning violations of law on Indian reservations or lands; operation of Indian arts and crafts shops and museums; and per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses of Indians participating in folk festivals; \$37,929,000.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we have just approved the item in the appropriation bill which provides funds for the general activities and services of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

In this connection, I wish to point out the need for an improvement in the administration of law and order on the average Indian reservation and particularly on the Pine Ridge Reservation in South Dakota.

I am told that so bad have conditions become that very few residents, white or Indian, within the boundaries of the reservation, feel safe to go out at night and particularly to attend dances or other social gatherings after dark.

There has been a complete breakdown of police protection. Within the past few years, several murders have been committed without charges being filed against suspects, much less convictions.

Delegations have appealed to the Governor of the State, but dispatch of representatives from the State justice department have been met by the statement that they lack jurisdiction on Indian lands. Now a movement is under way to create a sort of vigilantes organization among the people for their own protection.

The situation seems to be the result in part of trying to turn the problem of law and order over to the so-called law and order set-up under the Indian reorganization act and in part the result of inadequate appropriations or improper allocation of funds.

Whatever the cause, the situation merits a definite investigation by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and although I have previously discussed it with officials

of the Bureau, I wish to make it a matter of public record in connection with the passage of these appropriations.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION

For construction, major repair, and improvement of irrigation and power systems, buildings, utilities, roads and trails, and other facilities; acquisition of lands and interests in lands; preparation of lands for farming; and architectural and engineering services by contract; to remain available until expended, \$21,922,000, of which not to exceed \$3,737,500 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority previously granted; and, in addition, the Secretary is authorized to enter into contracts for the purposes of this appropriation in an amount not to exceed \$1,500,000.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FERNANDEZ:

On page 225, line 24, strike out "\$21,922,000" and insert "\$22,422,000."

On page 226, line 5, strike out "\$1,500,000" and insert "\$2,500,000."

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, in this appropriation bill our committee has cut down items affecting New Mexico, but I am not going to quarrel with the judgment of the committee as to those items with the exception of this particular one for the reason I believe that our committee in striking out the item which I attempt to restore by my amendment committed a very grievous error.

In order that we may get the full facts before the committee, let me give the committee a short history of this situation. The purpose of my amendment is to restore \$1,500,000 authorized last fall by an act passed by the Congress for the construction of an Indian and non-Indian hospital, a cooperative hospital to be used by Indians and non-Indians, in Bernalillo County.

The county of Bernalillo, of which the city of Albuquerque comprises about 90 percent, 2 years ago floated bonds to build its own little hospital, and after it had floated these bonds, Mr. Hageberg and Mr. Brophy, two of the finest men employed by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, went to the county commissioners and said, "We need a hospital for the Indians, and we are going to have to ask the Federal Government for an appropriation to build such a hospital. Why do we not join hands and build a joint hospital for both the use of the Indians and the use of the non-Indians?" After several weeks of negotiations they finally came to an agreement. This agreement was put into the form of a bill which was introduced by the New Mexico delegation and it was approved unanimously. It passed the House and the Senate and went to the President for his signature. The President in signing the bill took the very

unusual step in commending it in these words:

I wish to express my full approval of the basic objective of this legislation which is to encourage the integration of hospital facilities for the care of Indians and non-Indians in the same community.

The bill was approved by the President and the Bureau of the Budget approved the item of \$1,500,000; \$500,000 in cash and \$1,000,000 in contract authorizations. When it came to the committee, some of the members of the committee, particularly the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], felt the same way about the excellent policy established by such a law. But, when it came to marking up the bill, there was some concern about the exact wording of the law and because of a misunderstanding, I am sure, the appropriation was disallowed.

The misunderstanding came about because of some of the language in the bill. The bill provided that for this \$1,500,000, 100 beds be made available at all times to the Indians. It provided that the Federal Government pay for 80 percent of those beds made available to the Indians and the State would then have to carry the other 20 percent free of charge. It also provided that whenever it was thought necessary by the commissioners, the number of beds set aside for the Indians may be reduced, and that that may be done if in return the operator agreed that the minimum charge would be proportionately reduced. The committee was not sure whether under that language, if the number of beds were reduced at any time, the county would have to agree or whether it was discretionary with the county. We at all times have interpreted the law to mean that whenever they reduced those beds, the county, of course, would reduce the minimum payment, but, of course, because of that misunderstanding, the item was disallowed.

Since that time, after consultation with the members of the subcommittee, I have taken up the matter with the county commissioners, so as to have a complete understanding about it, and I have now before me a telegram signed by the chairman of the county commissioners, Mr. Cornelius, and by Mr. Brunacini, chairman of the hospital board of trustees, which reads as follows:

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., May 2, 1950.
HON. ANTONIO FERNANDEZ,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

Contracts with Commissioner of Indian Affairs will include a provision whereby if pursuant to the act authorizing the appropriation for county-Indian hospital at Albuquerque, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs reduces to less than 100 the number of beds required to be made available for Indians, the minimum payment to be made by said Commissioner will be proportionately reduced, and whereby if beds reserved for Indians are occupied by non-Indians said minimum payments will be reduced by the operators in proportion to such non-Indian occupancy. This provision is entirely satisfactory to the Bernalillo County commissioners and the hospital board of trustees.

We have always understood this to be the intent of the authorization act as passed last fall.

W. H. CORNELIUS,
Chairman, County Commissioners.
CHARLES C. BRUNACINI,
Chairman, Hospital Board of Trustees.

I think that that settles the question as to that rather ambiguous language.

Let me call to your attention one reason why I am so anxious, and why I plead with you, that this be restored. If this were an appropriation which we could consider next year, which could be postponed, I would not ask the House now to amend the bill. However, the county commissioners have their \$1,000,000 in the bank, and other moneys besides the bond money, on which they are paying interest to the bondholders. They have waited this long for the Federal Government to do its part in authorizing and in carrying out its part of the agreement. If this money is not made available this year, then the county commissioners of necessity must go ahead and build their own little hospital, and our opportunity to build a joint hospital will be gone. As a result, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs will have to come to Congress and get appropriations for a separate hospital. It will be much more expensive to the Federal Government, because it will have to construct, equip, and operate it, through its own personnel.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. I have been interested in the title to the hospital and the ground on which it is to be constructed. Will the gentleman explain how the title is going to be held, who will own it, or what part, or something about that?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The tract of land on which the hospital will be built, if it is a joint hospital, is a tract of land where the Indian tuberculosis hospital is now located. This building will be adjacent to it. Under another act passed by the Congress, the Indian Office is authorized for this purpose to donate this land to the county. Consequently, the county will hold the title.

Mr. NORRELL. Will there be any record title in the Federal Government for its share of the funds extended, including the lot on which it is being constructed?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. No; but of course the hospital will be dedicated to that purpose. Under the contract, it will be dedicated to that purpose in perpetuity. If at any time the county commissioners under this law should cease to operate it, then the Government may take it and operate it.

Mr. NORRELL. Then when the hospital is constructed, as far as the legal title is concerned, it will be vested in the county in which it is located?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I could not make the assertion definitely without checking the law, but I think it is vested in the county with the right of reversion if it is not used for that purpose. I am not certain about that.

Mr. NORRELL. At any rate, it would not be vested, or any part of it, in the Federal Government?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. No; because it is a county hospital.

Mr. NORRELL. That is the objection I have had to the item all the time.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. It is a county hospital, to be used for both the Indians and the non-Indians. In the use of the hospital, the county makes itself responsible for all expenses including any additions to the hospital and all the equipment of the hospital. The Federal Government is guaranteed the use of 100 beds, at least. Of course, we expect eventually to take over the health and hospital services for all Indians, and this is a step in that direction. That I think is the policy set by Mr. Nichols, the present Indian Commissioner, which is being followed by those two fine men in New Mexico, whom I mentioned, Mr. Brophy and Mr. Hagberg.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for four additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. As I said if the appropriation is not made at this time then the law which was passed under the direction of the Committee on Public Lands will be completely nullified. It may be if our committee had been writing this law and had been making the arrangements we might have made different arrangements perhaps as to the title, I will say to the gentleman from Arkansas, and perhaps as to the formula for participation. But we did not write this law. The legislative committee of this House, the Committee on Public Lands, after full study by the Bureau of the Budget and taking the amendments which the Bureau of the Budget suggested, passed the authorization. They had the responsibility and gave the terms of the law most careful consideration. Consequently if we do not appropriate the money this year we will have completely nullified the act passed by this Congress for that purpose, and we will be arrogating to ourselves the responsibility already discharged by the legislative committee.

There is another thing I want to call to the attention of the Congress and particularly to the attention of the gentleman from Arkansas who is worried a little bit about the title. Under this bill the authority to pay for these 80 percent of beds expires by the specific provisions of the act in 1954 and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs is then required to come back to the Congress and submit a report to us, in the light of its experience in this enterprise. Then the Congress is at liberty to make any kind of formula for the operation of this bill that the Congress sees fit. That is a rather onerous provision which was imposed on the county commissioners, for despite the fact that the authority to pay for these 80 percent of beds expires in 1954,

the provisions that the county shall continue to carry and maintain not less than 100 beds for the use of the Indians does not expire. They are obligated under this contract to that. So that if there is something in favor of the county commissioners which we might think is a little bit too favorable to them, there are these other provisions far more favorable to the Government, which we accepted because of the amendments suggested and required by the Bureau of the Budget. This is an experiment subject to adjustment, and the county authorities are willing to trust the good faith and good judgments of the Congress. Are we here to have less trust and confidence in the good faith and judgment of the Congress in the future?

Before I conclude let me read to you from the testimony given in the committee a statement made by the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL], in the consideration of this bill, which I think should be given consideration. He said:

I would like to say also, Mr. Chairman, for the record that one of the greatest handicaps for the Indian Bureau working out some of these cooperative arrangements I think is a lack of getting through appropriations on time. It makes it very difficult to work out these cooperative arrangements with local people when appropriations are delayed and uncertain. I think that is quite a handicap to the Indian Bureau in that regard and I wish that some sort of a plan might be promoted to give local people a little better assurance in the future as to what you will do here so far as appropriations are concerned.

I fully agree with that. If this appropriation is not now granted despite the fact that the county commissioners have made their plans in reliance upon this law and have expended upward of \$75,000 in drawing up plans and specifications, and have waited this long, paying interest to bondholders on their money in the bank, if we do not now appropriate the money notwithstanding the fact that they have acted in reliance upon this act, then we will thereby discourage any further attempts along these lines in the future by these various communities, and it will be a retrogressive step in the attempt to integrate the health services of the Indians with those of the State. Such integration will save the Federal Government many more millions of dollars in cost of hospital operations alone. Certainly one large hospital can be operated more efficiently and more economically.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, at the time this matter was considered in the committee I had some grave doubts as to the protection being accorded the Federal Government. Since that time I have had a number of discussions with the gentleman from New Mexico. So far as I am concerned, I am willing to accept the amendment on the following conditions, and I desire to make this a part of the legislative history of this amendment:

That no part of the appropriation or authorization herein made shall be available

for the construction of a hospital pursuant to Public Law 438, approved October 31, 1949, unless the contract relating to such hospital between the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the proper authorities of the county of Bernalillo, State of New Mexico, shall include a provision whereby if pursuant to said act the Commissioner of Indian Affairs reduces to less than 100 the number of beds required to be made available for Indians, the operator shall agree that the minimum payment to be made by said Commissioner will be proportionately reduced, and whereby if beds reserved for Indians are occupied by non-Indians said minimum payment shall be reduced by the operator in proportion to such non-Indian occupancy.

With that statement and on that condition, I will accept the amendment.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I certainly do appreciate the action of the gentleman from Washington. He has looked into this matter just as thoroughly as I have. We have been working at it ever since the committee met. This telegram which I have from the county commissioners does explicitly agree to those terms. Furthermore, the Indian Office has advised me, and were supposed to have sent me a letter to this effect, but I have not yet received, that that has been a part of the contract. It will be made a part of the contract.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The telegram has been read into the RECORD?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The telegram has been read into the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] has expired.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, certainly I believe this House knows of my great interest in preserving the health of our Indian population. I do not believe the Indian service has any better champion than I have been to that service. But it seems to me we are certainly deviating from the straight and narrow path as far as this Government is concerned.

I have no objection to building a general hospital for the Indians, but in Albuquerque we have a very fine tubercular institution for the Indians. Why we should help the State of New Mexico to build a hospital, not only for the Indians but for themselves, is beyond my comprehension. Certainly the other States of the Union are entitled to some consideration. The great State of New Mexico is to be lauded for its part in the matter, but, at the same time, it seems to me they are helping themselves too, by getting a very fine hospital and wanting the Federal Government to pay a million and a half dollars toward that, and at the same time maintain hospital beds for a certain proportion of the Indian patients when they are there. I just cannot see that.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FENTON. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. As a matter of fact, it was not the county commissioners that wanted this done. It is a new policy of the Federal Government in try-

ing to integrate the health services of the Indians with those of the whites. It was the Indian Office that brought the proposition to them. It was the Indian Department that negotiated this matter. It is the Indian Office that wants us to do that.

Mr. FENTON. Of course, I may say to the gentleman from New Mexico that if we listen to the Indian Bureau, on medical matters, according to their past performance, then the Indians are in a poor way. That is all I have to say about that.

Now, may I refer to the report. This is not my language in the report, but it reflects the opinion of all the members of the subcommittee:

The amount of \$500,000 cash and \$1,000,000 in contract authority requested for the construction of a hospital at Albuquerque, N. Mex., is not approved.

I did not write that language but it did reflect the opinion of all members of the subcommittee. Although the construction of this hospital is authorized by act of Congress, the committee is unwilling to recommend the appropriation requested for this purpose. This does not appear to be a hospital which would provide benefits for Indians commensurate with the expenditures planned. Certainly, for \$1,500,000, if there are only a few Indians in the hospital, they are not getting full value for what we are putting into it.

The proposed arrangement for having this hospital operated by the county in which it would be located, and the ambiguous provisions of the law respecting its operation have convinced the committee that it would be a bad precedent to appropriate funds for this construction.

I call particular attention to that portion of the report.

The subcommittee was in full accord; and, certainly, I for one have been very favorable to helping the Indians. I am not convinced that a general hospital for the Indians is so necessary in that particular section of the country. If additional Indian hospital facilities are to be built from money appropriated by this Congress, I think it should be in the form of an addition to the present Indian hospital in Albuquerque.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FENTON. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I wish to inform the House that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON], a medical doctor, has been very active in trying to do everything he could for sick Indians. I can understand why he takes the position he does.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania may proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. I certainly hesitate to go against Dr. FENTON's position, and I

shall not do it, because not only myself but most of the members of the committee have followed the gentleman from Pennsylvania on everything pertaining to the health of Indians.

The gentleman knows, does he not, that we made recommendations—or at least, I did after visiting the TB hospital in Albuquerque a few years ago; I recommended that we double the capacity of that hospital. There are something over 120 beds there now. The head of that hospital told me that with an extra doctor and a couple of extra nurses they could handle another 120 patients. No attention was paid to that recommendation. I am sorry they did not follow through in building an addition to the present TB hospital.

I hesitate, as does the doctor, to do anything that would hinder the Indians from getting the benefits they deserve and need; but I also hesitate to take issue with Dr. FENTON, who has taken care of this matter of Indian health not only for the minority side but also for the majority side of the committee for quite some years.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FENTON. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman contend that this amendment is not necessary or desirable in the interest of Indian health?

Mr. FENTON. That is absolutely correct, and I believe the subcommittee was of that frame of mind. We have no objection to hospitals being built for the Indians, but we feel that we should have some say in the matter; and, certainly, as my friend from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL] pointed out, there are certain legal aspects of this problem as to title that are far from being cleared up.

Mr. TABER. In view of what the gentleman from Pennsylvania has said, it seems to me that we ought to follow the judgment of those who have studied this thing thoroughly, as he has.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the authorization bill in regard to this matter came to our committee first, the Indian Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Lands, it then went to the Public Lands Committee of the House and was reported in turn by that committee. I hope the members of this Committee of the Whole will restore this amount and will approve the pending amendment because it seems to me that to do otherwise is to more or less abandon a program that we have already agreed upon. We want to assimilate the Indians fully into our society. We just passed a bill here a day or so ago involving the city of Salamanca in New York based upon that very theory of assimilating the Indians into our society of giving them more autonomy of not considering them second-rate citizens but of giving them fuller status of citizenship.

This amendment is in keeping with that program. It will be a good economic move in the long run and is a move in the right direction, not only in the matter of assimilation but in the mat-

ter of integration of integrating the resources and the strength and the financial power of the local community, the county in this instance, with the United States Government so that each may supplement the other and help the other, a joint effort, if you please, beneficial to both parties, beneficial to the good people in that particular county and beneficial to our Indian friends.

Mr. Chairman, certainly this is in keeping with the program that we have, so far, it seems to me, already agreed upon. The authorization bill is a public law now and the authority therefore has been given. As I recall it, the President of the United States complimented the Congress at the time it passed such a law. I know a great many people did. So it seems to me in the long run it would be for economy, it would be in keeping with a program we have already agreed upon, it would be doing justice to our Indian friends, it would be helpful to everybody involved and, really, I cannot see why there should be any opposition to this amendment.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FENTON. I know the gentleman is a great admirer of the Indians and rightly so because he comes from a great State which has treated the Indians very fine.

Mr. MORRIS. We have tried to.

Mr. FENTON. Of course, the great State of Oklahoma does not ask for a hospital like this for its Indians.

Mr. MORRIS. I beg the gentleman's pardon?

Mr. FENTON. The great State of Oklahoma would not come in and request this kind of legislation?

Mr. MORRIS. We would have no objection to this kind of legislation, I am certain we would not; in fact, we hope to have some similar legislation in the future.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. May I say to our distinguished friend this hearing was a very complete one. We had people from Bernalillo County who went into the matter very thoroughly with the Committee on Public Lands and the committee unanimously agreed that this is a very worthwhile project. We complimented the people in that area for the attitude they were taking in connection with our Indian brethren. We felt it was one of the most forward steps we had taken in trying to make the Indians a part of our society. I would feel very bad, I would regret very much, if now we would break faith with the people who had confidence in the Committee on Public Lands in its dealing with that problem.

Mr. MORRIS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. He is a member of our committee, he works faithfully and is interested, intensely, in the Indian problem and has given it a lot of study. His judgment, in my opinion, should carry great weight with this Congress.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. This law is merely one of the various laws that we have been adopting here lately in pursuance of a new policy which the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], on the other side of the aisle, has stressed time and again, and one that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] and many others have stressed who have been studying the Indian problem. That is the problem of integrating rather than segregating the Indians. Our country would be happy to take them over and they expect to do it in time, but in building this hospital they want a little help at the present time, and that is all they asked for when the suggestion was made to them. It was done, as I say, by Mr. Brophy and Mr. Hageberg, who believe in that policy; a forward-looking policy. If this is not accomplished, it will be a retrogressive step in that policy. I do not know whether they have one in Oklahoma, but they passed one in Montana exactly like this. We have complained about the fact that the Indians do not have a single, solitary accredited hospital. They are unable to do so, because the Government has to spend a lot of money trying to get staffs and have not been able to do it. Now, in joining hands with the State, under a State administration, the hospital will be constructed and it will be fully accredited, and the Indians as well as the non-Indians will gain. Furthermore, it will be more expensive to the Government to turn this thing down, after it has been passed by the Congress, and that will be the effect unless we have the appropriation this year. It will be penny wise and pound foolish. It is not economy to deny these funds; it is economy to provide them and have the State run this hospital through its own staff and through its own officials in its own integrated system.

Mr. MORRIS. Let me say this in conclusion. The Indian problem, I think, is recognized, by practically all, if not all of us, as being a national problem. Uncle Sam, the Federal Government, has been building Indian hospitals for a long time and maintaining them, and it is now doing so. It seems to me that we ought to be grateful to the people in the great State of New Mexico who offer to help pay the bill. This is a program of economy for Uncle Sam. Heretofore Uncle Sam has been footing all the bills in matters of this kind and certainly we must take care of those Indians out there and see that they are given the same health opportunities that our other Indian friends are given, and

unless we do this jointly then it will be incumbent upon Uncle Sam to pay all of the bills. But these people in New Mexico offer to pay about half of the bills, or at least a large part of them, so why should we object to that. It just does not seem reasonable to me that we should.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FERNANDEZ), there were—ayes 32, noes 29.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. FERNANDEZ and Mr. FENTON.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 57, noes 47.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made, including unused balances of related contract authorizations, under the heads "Construction, and so forth, buildings and utilities, Indian Service," "Construction, and so forth, irrigation systems, Indian Service," "Roads, Indian Service," "Navajo and Hopi construction and maintenance services," and "Acquisition of lands for Indian tribes," shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, when the appropriation for the Indian Bureau came before the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations certain testimony was given that subcommittee regarding money provided for Indian education in California, and other costs of the supervision of the Indian Bureau in that State.

The gentlemen on the committee will concur with me that certain Indians testified they desired independence from the Indian Bureau. Whether or not those Indians could be properly said to represent all the Indians of California or whether the testimony they gave was complete is not for me to discuss today. Neither is it for me to discuss whether or not the Indian Bureau should remove itself completely, or when, from the State of California.

The fact that we have for some 100 years professed to be trying to give the Indians their own independence, especially those Indians of the so-called Mission Indian Bands, and yet have not given them freedom, is something that requires discussion and action by the legislative committee. It is a fact that, whatever the case may be, it would be very difficult for the Indians if the subcommittee were to maintain the situation which now exists in this bill. The subcommittee removed all appropriations for Indian education, for the building of Indian schools, and for educational facilities in California.

Mr. DEWART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. DEWART. Last fall I had the opportunity to visit your mission school at Riverside, Calif., which is attended by several hundred Navajo Indians. I was amazed at the good work that school is doing and the education they are giving to the Indians. I think it would be too bad if the school is not carried on.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I thank the gentleman. I believe it is the contention of the chairman of the subcommittee that the funds for this particular school were not excluded from the bill.

I yield to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. KIRWAN. If an injustice has been done to the Indians in California, I can assure the gentleman that when this bill goes to conference, after the Senate holds its hearings and we mark up the bill, I will make every effort to see that the injustice is corrected.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I thank the gentleman. I knew he would do that. My point was simply that, even if the intent of the subcommittee to give independence to the Indians were carried out, it should not be done suddenly but should only be done when the State itself is given sufficient notice to arrange for educational facilities, the responsibility for which would then devolve upon the State.

I now yield to the distinguished chairman of the legislative subcommittee, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS].

Mr. MORRIS. This matter has disturbed me greatly, inasmuch as I am chairman of the subcommittee dealing with it. After I found out the status of the present bill, I started an investigation to determine just what the effect is. I believe I have been reliably informed that all funds for the great State of California involving Indians have been completely eliminated.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. That would be a very serious matter.

Mr. MORRIS. I think it is a serious matter. I know the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] will see that that wrong is righted, if it is humanly possible for him to do so. I hope we will not continue with a situation like that. For certainly, in my judgment, we should not cut off all the funds from the great State of California for the Indian Service, at least in one fell swoop. If we are going to do it, it should be done gradually.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to confirm what the gentleman has just stated. I do not believe the Indians who appeared before the committee were testifying for all the Indians of California. This is a very serious matter and I hope the cut that has been made can be restored.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I thank the gentleman.

I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. SCUDDER].

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to see the trend of thought here today because a great injustice has been done to the California Indians. The supposed representatives of the Indians, appearing before the committee, made statements which were not facts. The Hoopa authorization bill passed by the Congress last year, which I introduced and which was signed by the President, provided the necessary funds for the construction of the school facilities at the Hoopa Reservation, which funds are deleted entirely in the appropriation bill. The Indian and Federal holdings in that area do not develop any taxable property. The tax rate in the area is \$1.55 and the entire amount raised by taxes every year is \$560 on a small amount of personal property. They cannot build their own school facilities and must depend on Federal contribution; the State of California provides funds for the education of these Indian children; the Federal Government most certainly should provide the housing facilities. I have taken this problem up with the Senate committee and hope that the funds are reinstated.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I concur with the gentleman and say in conclusion that I shall offer no amendment here, to restore the funds deleted, having confidence that the matter will be corrected in the other body.

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS]. California has been mistreated in the striking of all of the funds for the Indians of California. It was done on the statement of one man to the effect that he represented the Indians of California. The State authorities were never given an opportunity to be heard, nor were any other Indian groups who dispute the statement that they were properly represented, or represented at all, by the gentleman who appeared before the Appropriations Subcommittee. As a matter of fact, the Governor of California, the superintendent of public instruction, and many of the officials of local government vigorously protest the withdrawal of these funds. Many Indian groups have protested to me and to other California Congressmen. It will inflict an unfair hardship on the Indians of California and upon local and State school and health agencies. It is discriminatory against California. When all Indians in every State are deprived of Federal funds as a matter of national policy we will be willing to take our cut along with the rest. But as long as that is not done, the California Indians should not be treated any differently than the others, and our State should not be required to take over and carry a burden which is a

Federal obligation and which is not imposed similarly on other States.

The Clerk read as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs (except the revolving fund for loans) shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase (not to exceed 227, of which 220 shall be for replacement only) and hire of passenger-motor vehicles, which may be used for the transportation of Indians; printing and binding, including illustrations and purchase of reprints; purchase of ice for official use of employees; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), including not to exceed \$5,000 for expenditure at rates for individuals not in excess of \$100 per diem on irrigation and power matters, when authorized by the Secretary; and expenses required by continuing or permanent treaty provisions.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: On page 227, after line 12, add the following new paragraph:

"Not to exceed \$1,000,000 of the funds herein provided for the Bureau of Indian Affairs shall be available for travel expenses."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is in the same category as the one I offered earlier in the afternoon in connection with the Bonneville Power Administration.

The amendment seeks to reduce the travel pay for the Bureau of Indian Affairs from \$1,400,000 to an even \$1,000,000, a reduction of \$400,000.

If every Member of this House, if every American who can understand the American language, would have the privilege of knowing some of the things that are going on in the Indian Bureau, I am sure there would not be very little opposition to this amendment. Certainly the Bureau of Indian Affairs has done a great many things that were neither good for the Indians nor good for America in general as most of you know, I am sure.

Here they are asking for \$1,400,000 just for travel expenses. It is criminal, purely and simply criminal, for the American taxpayers to pay \$1,400,000 just for travel expenses for the officials of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. VURSELL. Of course, a lot of us do not know anything about this. Where are they going to travel?

Mr. JENSEN. Well, we have an Indian Office here in Washington. Then we have a half dozen regional offices scattered all over the country. Then we have district offices, and we have local offices, and we have reservation offices, and they are filled with a lot of folks that do not have much else to do than travel around over the country, and so they just travel, when a letter or a telephone call would do just as well and possibly better. That is the answer. In fact, if I had my way, every regional office in the Indian Bureau would be abolished; in fact, we did abolish some of them during the Eightieth Congress, and it was good for the Indians.

Mr. VURSELL. How much are we spending on the Indians now?

Mr. JENSEN. The budget request for the fiscal year 1951 was the sum of \$85,996,375. Our committee reduced that amount to \$76,293,000, a reduction of \$9,703,375, which is by far the greatest amount ever before requested for the Bureau. But I am afraid the Indian people will not benefit anywhere near in proportion.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I intend to offer such an amendment as the gentleman has suggested on page 229, to abolish these regional Indian offices and cut out the appropriation.

Mr. JENSEN. I shall be glad to support the gentleman's amendment if it is clean-cut and will actually save some money.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Talking about travel expense, that is where the great increase comes in, traveling back and forth between regional offices.

Mr. JENSEN. And doing nothing but trying to tell the Indians what they should do; when, generally speaking, the Indians are smarter than the white folks who are trying to tell them a lot of stuff they already know.

I am sorry that Mr. William Brophy was not able to continue his work. He was the Commissioner of Indian Affairs for a couple of years and was doing fine work. Then he got sick and had to resign over a year or so ago. Since that time we have been going back to about the same kind of mess we had when Mr. Collier was Commissioner of Indian Affairs. For the past few months we have had a Commissioner of Indian Affairs by the name of Nichols, but he had too much common sense; he was doing too good a job. They could not handle him and so they replaced him with one Dillon Myer, who tried to handle the Japanese concentration camps during the war, and I have been told by good authority that they had more trouble with Dillon Myer than they did with all the Japanese in those camps.

Listen to this, my colleagues: Here is what Col. W. D. Archie, of military police, who had considerable to do with Japanese concentration camps during World War II, had to say in his own newspaper, the Shenandoah Sentinel, of Shenandoah, Iowa, about the recent appointment of Dillon Myer as Commissioner of the Bureau of Indian Affairs:

ALONG THE BANKS OF THE NISHNA

(By W. D. Archie)

Dillon F. Myer has been chosen as head of the Bureau of Indian Affairs by President Truman. It sickens me to think such a thing can happen in our Government. It shows what a low state we are in, and why such men as Senator McCARTHY are forced to such extremes to try to clean up the sordid Washington mess among Government employees. Not that Myer is not a good American. He is just inefficient.

This Dillon Myer is one of the original New Dealers. He has little ability but plenty of pull. He gets into trouble in every job he is given but is immediately transferred to a better one every time this happens. During the war he headed the Japanese relocation camps and I personally had contact with these camps. He made more trouble

than did all the Japs in the camps. Every decision he made was on the basis of new dealism. Along toward the end of the war it got so bad he was transferred. But he didn't lose his job with the Government. Instead he was soon found to be heading one of the big housing jobs.

Now he is to head the important Bureau of Indian Affairs. The poor Indians. They have been mistreated by our Government from the very beginning and now they must suffer with this man Myer. And as I said in the beginning it is sickening that such a thing can happen in our Government.

I trust my amendment will be adopted. Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is similar to the one previously offered in connection with the Bonneville Power Administration. I hope the Committee will vote it down.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. How do they spend all this million and a half? What is it used for?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I may state to the gentleman from Massachusetts that the amount approved for the current fiscal year is \$1,030,000. The Budget estimate for the fiscal year was \$1,400,023.

We must take into consideration that the program, particularly for hospitalization, and for schools, represents a substantial expansion in this bill. In addition, per diem costs were raised from \$6 to \$9 by the Congress last year and we are bound by that law; also, the mileage cost for the use of private automobiles was also increased. Furthermore, the area covered by the Indian Service is very substantial. If you look at a map of New Mexico and Arizona you will see what tremendous areas have to be covered and what a transportation problem this offers. The Indian reservations in these States are larger than some States of the Union. To administer such a tremendous program entails some expense.

Our subcommittee wants to hold costs down and we have cut the Indian Bureau substantially. We have tried to approve those items relating to hospitalization, education, and to approve also programs that have been suggested to get the Indians off the reservation into jobs where they can be assimilated into the community. That is our objective.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JACKSON, of Washington) there were—ayes 40, noes 51.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. JENSEN and Mr. JACKSON of Washington.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 49, noes 61.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

CLAIMS AND TREATY OBLIGATIONS

For fulfilling treaties with Senecas and Six Nations of New York, Choctaws and Pawnees of Oklahoma, and payment to Indians of Sioux reservations, to be expended as provided by law, such amounts as may be necessary after June 30, 1950.

PROCEEDS FROM POWER

After June 30, 1950, not to exceed the amount of power revenues covered into the Treasury to the credit of each of the power projects, including revenues credited prior to August 7, 1946, shall be available for the purposes authorized by section 3 of the act of August 7, 1946 (Public Law 647), as amended, including printing and binding, in connection with the respective projects from which such revenues are derived.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language appearing on page 227, lines 13 to 18, inclusive, and on page 227, lines 19 to 25, inclusive, and page 228, lines 1 and 2 on the ground that it is permanent legislation on an appropriation bill.

The language to which the point of order is made is as follows:

CLAIMS AND TREATY OBLIGATIONS

For fulfilling treaties with Senecas and Six Nations of New York, Choctaws and Pawnees of Oklahoma, and payment to Indians of Sioux reservations, to be expended as provided by law, such amounts as may be necessary after June 30, 1950.

PROCEEDS FROM POWER

After June 30, 1950, not to exceed the amount of power revenues covered into the Treasury to the credit of each of the power projects, including revenues credited prior to August 7, 1946, shall be available for the purposes authorized by section 3 of the act of August 7, 1946 (Public Law 647), as amended, including printing and binding, in connection with the respective projects from which such revenues are derived.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Washington desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I concede both points of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the points of order.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JACKSON of Washington: On page 227 after line 12 insert the following:

"CLAIMS AND TREATY OBLIGATIONS

"For fulfilling treaties with Senecas and Six Nations of New York, Choctaws and Pawnees of Oklahoma, and payment to Indians of Sioux reservations, to be expended as provided by law, such amounts as may be necessary during the current fiscal year.

"PROCEEDS FROM POWER

"Sums not in excess of the amount of power revenues covered into the Treasury to the credit of each of the power projects, including revenues credited prior to August 7, 1946, to be available for the purposes authorized by section 3 of the act of August 7,

1946 (Public Law 647), as amended, including printing and binding, in connection with the respective projects from which such revenues are derived."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

TRIBAL FUNDS

In addition to the tribal funds authorized to be expended by existing law, there is hereby appropriated \$2,525,465 from tribal funds not otherwise available for expenditure for the benefit of Indians and Indian tribes, including pay and travel expenses of employees; care, tuition and other assistance to Indian children attending public and private schools (which may be paid in advance or from date of admission); purchase of land and improvements on land, title to which shall be taken in the name of the United States in trust for the tribe for which purchased; lease of lands and water rights; printing and binding; compensation and expenses of attorneys and other persons employed by Indian tribes under approved contracts; pay, travel and other expenses of tribal officers, councils, and committees thereof, or other tribal organizations, including mileage for use of privately owned automobiles and per diem in lieu of subsistence at rates established administratively but not to exceed those applicable to civilian employees of the Government; relief of Indians, without regard to section 7 of the act of May 27, 1930 (46 Stat. 391), including cash grants; and employment of a recreational director for the Menominee Reservation and a curator for the Osage Museum, each of whom shall be appointed with the approval of the respective tribal councils and without regard to the classification laws: *Provided*, That \$100,000 of the amount appropriated herein shall be available from the judgment fund appropriated for the Indians of California by section 203 of the act of April 25, 1945 (59 Stat. 77), to be advanced for compensation and expenses of attorneys and other persons employed by any tribe, band, or other identifiable group of Indians of California under contracts approved by the Secretary, each such advance creating a charge on any judgment or settlement won by such tribe, band, or group, reimbursable out of such judgment or settlement, with interest at 4 percent per annum, to the judgment fund of the Indians of California: *Provided further*, That in addition to the amount appropriated herein, tribal funds may be advanced to Indian tribes for such purposes as may be designated by the governing body of the particular tribe involved and approved by the Secretary. Any tribal funds advanced under this authority shall be reported to the Congress in the annual budget for the next succeeding fiscal year.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order, on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill, against the language commencing with the word "*Provided*" in line 3, page 229, reading:

That \$100,000 of the amount appropriated herein shall be available from the judgment fund appropriated for the Indians of California by section 203 of the Act of April 25, 1945 (59 Stat. 77), to be advanced for compensation and expenses of attorneys and other persons employed by any tribe, band, or other identifiable group of Indians of California under contracts approved by the Secretary, each such advance creating a charge on any judgment or settlement won by such tribe, band, or group, reimbursable out of such judgment or settlement, with interest

at 4 percent per annum, to the judgment fund of the Indians of California.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Washington desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITE of Idaho: On page 229, after line 21, insert the following:

"No part of the funds herein appropriated under the head 'Bureau of Indian Affairs' shall be used for the establishment or maintenance in the United States, exclusive of Alaska, of area offices of the Bureau of Indian Affairs by whatever term such offices may be designated or for the compensation of employees in such offices, but this limitation shall not prevent the allocation of funds, otherwise expendable in connection with such area offices, for use in the improvement of services rendered to Indians in their home communities."

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, this amendment when passed will abolish the so-called area offices of the Indian Bureau located in various cities of the United States. In offering this amendment it is not proposed to reduce the appropriation of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, but that such funds be utilized for the improvement of services in their home communities. The program of maintaining an area office by the Indian Bureau has been in existence for several years. Many of these regional offices have been abolished at one time or another, but have always managed to crop up again under different names, and at the present time 11 area offices are now in existence. The contention of the Bureau of Indian Affairs is that they can give better services to Indians by decentralizing authority between Washington and the Indian reservations. Under this three-level system of administration the Indians have experienced such inconveniences as lack of local government services, delay by additional red tape, and general inefficiency which has stymied the progress of the Indians whom the administration of the Bureau of Indian Affairs is intended to help.

The following data, compiled from the many communications received in favor of this proposed amendment, produce irrefutable evidence to justify the abolishment of the area-office method of administration of Indian affairs.

DISADVANTAGES OF AREA OFFICES

First. Geographic locations: Area offices are usually located in cities hundreds of miles away, where the Indian Bureau representatives are not in contact with Indian problems and are not aware of reservation needs.

Second. Misleading theory in authority delegation: While the area-office idea of the Bureau of Indian Affairs was to decentralize authority from Washington to the field where it would be readily accessible to Indians on reservations, this theory of middleman-area office by rank of position has automatically absorbed

essential authority from reservations; it is the belief of the Indians that, because of their proper locations in the field, the reservation superintendents are in daily contact with their Indians' problems and should, therefore, retain the final authority in important recommendations to Washington.

Third. Slows up procedures: In matters requiring immediate decisions, the problems are first routed to the area offices to secure their recommendations, before they are passed on to the final authority, which is the Commissioner of Indian Affairs in Washington, D. C.

Fourth. Encourages irrational decisions: In many cases, recommendations in important decisions are given arbitrarily by the area directors who, being miles away from Indian reservations, and, due to lack of sufficient time for thorough investigations of cases involved, would naturally lack first-hand information to give such problems just recommendations.

Fifth. "Mice will play when cat is away": When authority is delegated from Washington to the field, it should be given to the reservation superintendents; or, better still, to the Indians themselves. No authority should be delegated to a "no-man's-land" between Washington and the reservations. What is done by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and his staff in Washington is under constant scrutiny by Congress; and what is done by the reservation superintendent and his staff in the field is under constant scrutiny by the Indians. But what is done in area offices far from Washington and far from any Indian reservation is not subject to anybody's scrutiny and is productive of waste and delay.

Sixth. Prevents Indian participation: Where an area office is hundreds of miles away, in some cases, more than 600 miles, the Indians cannot participate in a program intended for them because of lack of proper guidance and protection by Indian service personnel, and hence lose all interest in any beginning toward the Government's plans for Indian self-government. This system encourages the Bureau to cling to the now obsolete idea of working out problems for the Indians, rather than the doctrine they preach of working with them to solve their own problems.

Seventh. Deprives Indians of needed services: The operation of the area office system of administration has resulted in the separation of personnel badly needed on the reservation agencies, such as extension workers, nurses, Indian police, judges, and other positions most essential to the needs of the reservations; and funds denied from these positions have been used to establish and maintain the area offices.

Eighth. Waste of taxpayers' money: The three-level system of Indian Bureau administration is a waste of taxpayers' money, since it is used to maintain an expensive yet mythical branch of the Indian service which is of no value to Indians in their intended program of progress. It misrepresents

what would be the true objectives of the Indian service, with its top-heavy emphasis in merely perfecting standards of operations within the Bureau to protect its employees, at the expense of denying the Indians' greatest need for moral, social, and economic development. The existence of any branch of the Indian service can only be justified by the services it renders to Indians, and the area offices are a far cry in their present status, to be of any value whatsoever to Indians within their reservations.

Ninth. Establishment lacks Indians' consent: The establishment of area offices which unjustly deprived the Indians of Indian service personnel on their reservations, was carried out in secrecy, without due consent of the Indians.

Tenth. Road to false freedom: Ninety percent of the Indians residing within Indian reservations are at present against the program of so-called Indian emancipation. Although the Indians have never been directly informed, this area-office program of withdrawal from Indian reservations fits into a pattern using the area-office system as a painless method of emancipating the Indians, better referred to by the Indians as "false freedom." The Indians' reason for opposing such a measure is that if in their present status, and without further preparations, their wardship should be removed, they would fall prey to land-hungry, non-Indian exploiters who would eventually deprive them of land and property upon which hinges their very existence. This area-office method, withdrawing personnel from reservations, is a make-believe that Indians are about ready to be turned loose, and is certainly paving the way to just such a false freedom.

Eleventh. Area-office abolition recommended by NCAI: Under date of September 24, 1949, at the convention of the National Congress of American Indians, held in Rapid City, S. Dak., the following resolution was proposed and approved by an overwhelming majority of the more than 200 Indian delegates present, representing more than 25 of our 48 States:

Whereas the proposed system of area offices of the Indian Office will involve expenditures of additional money that could be better used at the agencies themselves; and

Whereas it is more efficient to place local power in the superintendent, instead of vesting it in area or national officials; and

Whereas the Commissioner has promised the abolition of district offices so that more money will go to the reservations: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Congress of American Indians opposes the plan for establishment of area offices of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and request more powers be vested in local superintendents and local councils.

I have read with great disappointment Indian Office Order No. 549, approved by the Secretary of the Interior, September 13, 1949, a program of Indian Bureau reorganization. This program of reorganization, while it could have been designed to meet the Indians' greatest needs, is in substance patterned merely to better intra-Bureau relationships. It

selfishly aims, at prohibitive cost, to keep the Bureau of Indian Affairs in line with regulations prescribed by such agencies as the Bureau of the Budget, the General Accounting Office, and the Civil Service Commission, thus protecting heads of departments as well as subordinate employees within the Bureau. It fails in its entirety to meet the needs of the Indians themselves, in their honest efforts to attain standards of progress established by our civilization.

At this critical time, when foreign countries are watching us with critical eye, looking for shortcomings of our Government in dealing with minority groups, it is best that we deal with greater zeal and sincerity with our local Indian people. At present we are going all out to feed and support foreign countries, even to the extent of jeopardizing the economic soundness of our country, yet we forget to take care of our just obligations at home. Our assistance to foreign nations is charity. But we cannot look upon our aid in the form of services to our Indians as charity. These services which we can render them are restitutions and part of the price we have offered to our American Indian people from whom we have ruthlessly confiscated lands rich in resources, that have made our country the greatest in the world today.

With all the handicaps and limitations circumstances have placed upon them, our Indian people on the reservations are striving wholeheartedly to meet the requirements set forth by our fast-moving civilization. With their population of less than 400,000 in the United States, they without question answered our country's call in time of war, thus joining us in our efforts to retain the American way of life. As an example, on the Coeur d'Alene Reservation, with a population of less than 700, more than 30 Indian boys entered the services of our armed forces; 11 of them were volunteers; and 6 of them gave their lives for our common cause. In return for which, rather than gratitude, the Bureau of Indian Affairs continues to employ irrational methods of administration, many of which have resulted in pushing our young Indian men into the gutters of failure and despair. This method of area-office administration, in itself, holds an intrinsic evil in that it utterly uses funds for a purpose other than for what it is intended.

I, therefore, strongly urge my colleagues in Congress to adopt this worthy amendment to abolish the area offices in order that our Indians may realize the justice and securities that we have so solemnly promised them in past treaties.

May I again emphasize that the area-office plan of administration of Indian Affairs seeks only to protect its heads of departments and its employees within the Bureau and hence does not attain the purpose for which Indian-service funds are annually appropriated. Let us disperse this idea and reestablish personnel back to the Indian reservations to serve as guidance, and to protect our Indians in their own efforts to attain eventual total self-sufficiency.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Just what does the gentleman's amendment do? May I ask him whether it is a clean-cut amendment to abolish the regional offices of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and by so doing will it reduce this appropriation by the amount that the regional offices are costing? Just what does the amendment do?

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. What this amendment proposes to do is to abolish the regional offices so that the money will go to administer the affairs of the Indians on the Indian reservations which will otherwise be spent for traveling and for maintenance and for salaries of an area office force far removed from the Indians.

Mr. JENSEN. I wish the gentleman's amendment were clean-cut.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, if we are interested in economy, if we are interested in carrying out the policy of the Bureau of Indian Affairs in contracting the Indians and administering their affairs, we should abolish these regional offices.

Mr. JENSEN. I agree with the gentleman that we should abolish the regional offices, but I am afraid the gentleman's amendment is not going to do much good for the Indian service. Certainly we need to do more than just abolish the offices and then take the same personnel which they will put into all these reservation headquarters so that we will have the same bunch to contend with again. They will just make regional offices out of every one of the reservation offices under the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I do not think that would be done.

Mr. JENSEN. I am sorry, but I just cannot see that.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I think money would be saved by abolishing these offices and the money saved would help the Indians rather than be spent to maintain distant offices which will not be in contact with the Indians and which defeat the purpose of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. I hope the gentleman will vote for the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there is inserted herewith a letter from Lyzeme Savage, manager of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, which is one of a large number of letters received in support of this legislation.

MINNESOTA CHIPPEWA TRIBE,
Cass Lake, Minn., April 28, 1950.
Representative WHITE, Democrat, Idaho,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WHITE: I am sending along a clipping taken from the Minneapolis Star of Wednesday evening, April 26, 1950. The amendment you propose to have added to the section covering

the Interior Department bill, Bureau of Indian Affairs, is in agreement with the thinking of the Minnesota Tribe, which includes 15,000 enrollees. As you probably are aware, Public Law 841, Eightieth Congress, for the fiscal year of 1949, stipulated and provided funds for district offices at Billings and Portland only; however, the upkeep of three others were maintained notwithstanding. This undoubtedly was done with the hope and plan of reestablishing a better and more elaborate set-up.

For the fiscal year of 1951, there were set up 11 area offices which is nothing more than the old district offices. The decentralization so far has done nothing to reduce the house-keeping work at the agencies, neither has it benefited the Indians more—on the contrary it has increased the load of our skeleton forces. Elimination of the needless district, regional, and area offices perhaps would be gained if the title of appropriations were changed from "Field" Administration to "Reservation" Administration, and if stipulation were included in your amendment that appropriated funds are to be used only for those reservation agencies which were established prior to the setting up of the so-called district, regional, and area offices.

Example after example can and has undoubtedly been presented to you showing the inefficiency of operations, the overlapping of work phases, and the last but not least, excessive cost of over-all operations. The procedure is simple, for if overhead costs are cut, the profit is greater. What the Indian needs is greater profit from the funds a generous Congress appropriates.

As manager of the tribe here and speaking in their behalf, I urge you to have an amendment to the bill made as stipulated and I trust other lawmakers will aid in its becoming law. Such would mean much to the Indians; we need more aid, and do not desire to be used as tools for a "build-up to brass."

Very truly yours,

LYZEME SAVAGE, Manager.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, last fall I had opportunity to visit the Indian school at Riverside, Calif. The school is attended largely by several hundred Navajo Indian boys and girls, from the ages of 9 or 10 to 17. These pupils do all their own work, under the supervision of a few teachers. They keep their rooms, maintain the buildings and grounds in immaculate order; they prepare their own meals and even cobble their shoes. I visited the shops, as well as the class rooms where they learn to read and write, and by doing all of these things, they become proficient in home economics and various trades.

I have never visited a school which was run more efficiently or where the students were more attentive and interested in their studies.

I was much impressed by this school and I am glad to have this opportunity to tell the Congress about this splendid institution.

I would like also to mention briefly the matter of education of Indian children in public schools through tuition contracts between the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the States. One of these contracts covers the education of Indian children in the public schools of Montana.

This is an excellent system of securing a proper education for the Indian children, and beyond that it is the best possible step toward making the Indian a real citizen and equal member of our society. The Indian and non-Indian children work and learn and play together. It is a healthy situation and one which will contribute greatly to the eventual end of the wardship status of the American Indian.

At present there is some difficulty in my State about the amounts of tuition to be paid by the Federal Government. State education authorities feel that they must have sizable increases over the amounts appropriated in 1950 and in the present bill. A matter of policy is involved which must be settled before it jeopardizes the success of this education program. One thing is certain: Where the Indian children are attending public schools in large numbers, in reservation districts where the trust status of Indian land reduces the tax base to a point where any kind of school is difficult to support, the Federal government must be prepared to pay its proper share of the cost of operating the schools. There should be no quibbling and no shirking of responsibility in this important obligation. It is an obligation both to the Indians and to the non-Indian citizens who are cooperating in this public-education program.

Mr. Chairman, the question raised by this amendment, concerning the operation of area offices of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, is one which has been discussed frequently in recent years and one with which I am familiar.

The original idea of decentralizing Indian Bureau affairs by establishing area offices, close to the reservations, where the bulk of Indian business could be transacted, was a good idea. The objections we are now hearing from many Indian tribes is not, I feel, an objection to this idea. It is an objection to the manner in which the system has operated.

I think the Indians would have no objection if they were able to send their business to the Billings, Mont., office, for example, and have it handled there speedily and effectively by men who were close enough to the problems to have a real understanding of them. When in the past I have defended the area-office system, I have done so because I believed that this was the intention of the Bureau.

We find, however, that the Bureau has in many instances failed to give the area offices a sufficiently clear outline of responsibility or sufficient authority to enable them to operate effectively and as the time-saving agency they should be.

Recently there has been an oil development on the Fort Peck Reservation in Montana. Oil leases have been signed which mean money to the Indians. Amounts of from several hundred to perhaps several thousand dollars are coming to the Indians as a result of this development. The leases were sent to the Billings area office for review. They were reviewed there, fully and in detail, or so I am informed. If the area-office system were working properly, that should have been enough. But now we

find that these same leases have been in Washington several weeks where a man has been detailed by the Indian Office to review them once again. Final approval has been delayed. There is an apparent duplication of effort. The money these Fort Peck people need so badly, money they should have so that they can get started again after a very difficult winter, is still held up by the rigamarole of review and review.

If we are going to have area offices, we should let them do the work. If we are not going to let them do the work, we may as well not have them.

I have found that in many instances the Billings area office has been of real value. However, to the individual Indians who have business to transact, it appears to be just another bureau where their business is delayed. No one can blame them for wanting to do away with this extra delay. However, in my own opinion it is the Washington office rather than the Billings office that has failed in this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WHITE of Idaho) there were—ayes 7, noes 41.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STIGLER: On page 228, line 6, strike out "\$2,525,465" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,530,965."

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment resulted from a request by the Creek Tribe of Indians of our State for \$5,500 of their tribal funds to acquire approximately 35 acres of land adjoining the Creek Indian school located at Eufaula. A resolution was passed by the Creek Tribal Council and a request was sent to us. I appeared before the committee. It was thought after the bill was marked up that sufficient authority was contained in this section to grant the request of the Creek Indians. Upon contacting the budget officer and the budget officer for the Indian Office, it was thought that this amount of \$5,500 should be added to the total so that there could not be any question about the authority. Subsequent to that time I have contacted the majority members of the subcommittee, as well as the minority members, and I was advised that there is no objection to offering the amendment on the floor.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is in order, and we accept it.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. STIGLER. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Since the amendment was prepared by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STIGLER] I invite his attention to the fact that a point of order has been made to the item appearing on page 229, beginning in line 3 running through line 14, which had the effect of removing \$100,000 that had been previously included in the bill for attorneys' fees for the California tribe. In view of that, I desire to offer

a substitute amendment which will reduce the over-all figure by that amount, \$100,000, which will have the effect of taking care of the item reduced by the point of order, and will also take care of the item that the gentleman has spoken of, which I accept.

Mr. STIGLER. That is agreeable to me.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. JACKSON of Washington to the amendment offered by Mr. STIGLER: Strike out "\$2,530,965" and insert "\$2,430,965."

The substitute amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment as amended by the substitute.

The amendment as amended by the substitute was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL INVESTIGATION

For engineering and economic investigations of proposed Federal reclamation projects and studies of water conservation and development plans; engineering and economic investigations, as a basis for legislation, and for reports thereon to Congress, relating to projects for the development and utilization of the water resources of Alaska; formulating plans and preparing designs and specifications for authorized Federal reclamation projects or parts thereof prior to appropriations for construction of such projects or parts; and activities preliminary to the reconstruction, rehabilitation and betterment, financial adjustment, or extension of existing projects; to remain available until expended, \$5,150,000, of which \$4,400,000 shall be derived from the reclamation fund and \$500,000 shall be derived from the Colorado River development fund: *Provided*, That the expenditure of any sums from this appropriation for investigations of any nature requested by States, municipalities, or other interests shall be upon the basis of the State, municipality, or other interest advancing at least 50 percent of the estimated cost of such investigations: *Provided further*, That the limitation on the amount available for surveys and preconstruction work in connection with the North Side pumping division, Minidoka project, Idaho, stated in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1950, is increased from \$725,000 to \$1,000,000: *Provided further*, That, except as herein expressly provided with respect to investigations in Alaska, no part of this appropriation shall be expended in the conduct of activities which are not authorized by law.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER:

On page 230, line 15, strike out "\$5,150,000" and insert "\$2,500,000".

On page 230, line 16, strike out "\$4,400,000" and insert "\$2,200,000".

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment to reduce the funds for general investigations, economic investigations, and engineering investigations on proposed Federal reclamation projects, and studies of water conservation and development plans, by \$2,500,000. This is my objective; let me

state my reasons: In the rivers-and-harbors and flood-control set-up we have wiped out the provision for planning to develop new projects. At this time, when there is absolutely no excuse for embarking on any new reclamation projects, why we should continue planning for additional reclamation projects is beyond me. The situation at the present time, a situation that will probably continue for a great many years, is that we have a production of wheat nearly double the requirements of the United States and what we can sell, and there is a similar picture with reference to corn and other agricultural products. Why, at a time when we do not need the land, we should spend enormous sums of money for the development of plans for new reclamation projects is beyond any reasonable conception.

I am not hostile to the development of reclamation projects where we need the resources, but to develop new agricultural lands and new agricultural production for the purpose of providing a surplus which the Department or somebody else must immediately take off the market by an expenditure of Federal funds is beyond my comprehension. There must come a time when we approach this situation honestly and fairly, and do not approach it with the idea of just spending money and destroying the United States. I appreciate that people like to have expenditures made in their territory; frankly, there are a lot of people in my own territory who would like to have Federal money poured in there, but at this time when we have not the money to pay for it, when we have a deficit in sight, an admitted deficit of \$6,000,000,000 for this year, and perhaps \$7,000,000,000 for next, at a time when we have declining revenues, how we can afford not to cut down at every opportunity that presents itself, how we can afford to go on developing plans for something we ought not to embark upon and that we know we ought not to embark upon for a great many years, is way beyond my comprehension.

I hope this amendment will be adopted and that we will take advantage of the opportunity to save \$2,650,000.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I certainly share the gentleman's views. I call his attention to the fact that with the condition of the Federal purse what it is today, we have a provision in this bill for investigation for new projects that is even greater than a similar provision carried in last year's bill.

Mr. TABER. That is correct and there is absolutely to excuse for it because our situation is such that we ought to avoid every possible unnecessary expenditure.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

This reads:

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

For engineering and economic investigations of proposed Federal reclamation projects and studies of water conservation and

development plans; engineering and economic investigations, as a basis for legislation, and for reports thereon to Congress, relating to projects for the development and utilization of the war resources of Alaska; formulating plans and preparing designs.

Is there any Member of this Congress who wants to cut investigations down to \$2,500,000 for Alaska where we are spending hundreds of millions of dollars right now on defense projects? Suppose the armed forces—Army, Navy, or Air Force—asked for houses and water up there in that part of our country? Who is going to give it to them? Where is the information coming from? It has got to come from the Department of the Interior primarily.

Mr. TABER. There is plenty of money available to take care of the Alaskan situation in the two and one-half millions I have left in the bill.

Mr. KIRWAN. No. This is the one part of this bill where we made a really substantial cut.

Mr. TABER. A cut was made there, yes, but the committee still has allowed more money than this agency had last year.

Mr. KIRWAN. There is, as the gentleman well knows, more work going on in Alaska today than ever before and necessarily so.

Mr. TABER. You do not need anything outside of the Alaska job.

Mr. KIRWAN. You do not need it?

Mr. TABER. No.

Mr. KIRWAN. If there is any information needed anywhere in this country who is going to furnish it? We have robbed this Nation for the last 200 or 300 years of its resources. Now we could spend millions of dollars on investigation to find out how to go about the work of replenishing some of our vanishing resources, putting back into the Nation what we took out of it. I repeat, again, there is not a Member of this Congress who wants to see the terrible situation in Alaska as it is depicted in the magazines.

We should have learned our lesson in the recent war when we built the Alcan Highway. We did not have the proper information, and we never allowed the Army and the Bureau of Public Roads money for investigation. The Army came along and spent hundreds of millions of dollars on a highway that should never have been built. Yet we protest vigorously about allowing \$2,000,000 for investigations. When we want to do something we are not prepared to do it because we are afraid to face up to realities.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment is defeated.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that in the justification for this item, pages 168 and 169 of the hearings, there is not anything said about Alaska. It all has to do with other places insofar as any of them are specifically mentioned.

Mr. KIRWAN. The gentleman, as the RECORD will show, wants to make a cut in the \$5,000,000 item reading "and for

reports thereon to Congress, relating to projects for the development and utilization of the water resources of Alaska."

Mr. TABER. The Alaska investigations are only \$250,000. The two and one-half million dollars that are left would take care of that 10 times over.

Mr. KIRWAN. Does the gentleman realize how much water it takes to make 1 ton of steel?

Mr. TABER. I do not know.

Mr. KEATING. Water is our finest and greatest mineral. It takes about 250 tons of water to make 1 ton of steel. That is a part of the investigation.

Mr. TABER. There is no steel in this bill.

Mr. KIRWAN. This is for investigations to get water to make steel and other beneficial uses.

Mr. TABER. Where do you get steel anywhere around where this Territory is located?

Mr. KIRWAN. This item is for an investigation of our water and other resources all over America. The Geological Survey has men all along the streams, in all our steel valleys, testing the water datum. That comes out of the fund for this Department, whether it is in Youngstown, Ohio, Chicago, Utah, or Alaska. All over this Nation you will find men setting up the instruments along the streams investigating the water.

I again say do not start cutting or trying to cut this one thing which covers investigations of our natural resources, and which is what we need to keep this country in a proper perspective.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. I have already had complaints from my area that this committee, with the pending provision—not the amendment suggested, but the existing provision—has cut this to the bone.

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes; and you are not alone.

Mr. CARROLL. I find that during the fiscal year 1951 that the Bureau of Reclamation asked for \$12,500,000, and the Bureau of the Budget cut that to \$7,800,000, and then the committee cut it again to \$5,500,000.

Mr. KIRWAN. It is the one part of the bill that our committee cut more than any other part.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 42, noes 53.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that the amendment apply to

the section just read and the succeeding section.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will the amendment to the succeeding section affect the dollar amount in those sections?

Mr. HOLMES. It will not affect the over-all total of the bill but it will affect the dollar amount in both sections; both the section first read and the succeeding section.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will it affect the dollar amount in the next succeeding section?

Mr. HOLMES. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HOLMES]:

On page 230, line 13, after the word "expended", insert the sum "\$4,975,000", instead of "\$5,150,000."

Page 230, line 16, after the word "which", insert the sum "\$4,225,000", instead of "\$4,400,000."

Page 231, line 11, after the word "expended", insert "\$297,642,000", instead of "\$297,467,000."

Page 231, line 12, after the word "which", insert "\$23,072,700", instead of "\$22,897,700."

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, while this amendment sounds a little intricate, it is a very simple amendment, which is why I submitted the request I did. It takes from the general investigation funds \$175,000 and adds to the construction funds this same \$175,000.

The reason for this amendment is this: The Budget allowed the Kennewick extension of the Yakima project in the State of Washington \$175,000 of planning money. It therefore will not affect the planning or investigation moneys for any other projects.

The Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations in its report on page 172, at the bottom of the page, states as follows:

The committee does not agree with the determination of the Bureau of the Budget in rejecting appropriations for the construction of the Kennewick division, Yakima project, Washington, under this expression of policy. The committee has considered this division and has determined that it is not a new project but is part of the Yakima project under such policy.

Therefore, the purpose of this amendment, without interfering with budget approval or without interfering with investigation moneys for any other projects in the United States, is merely to transfer the \$175,000 for planning on the Kennewick division of the Yakima project from that category of investigation to the category of construction money for that project, under the suggestion of the committee's statement that it is not considered by the committee as a new project.

I urge that this amendment be adopted and that the \$175,000 be placed in the category of aid to construction.

In closing, may I add that the transfer of these moneys will not in any way change the total sum of money involved in the entire bill. It merely transfers \$175,000 from general investigations to the construction moneys in the succeeding chapter, under the unanimous consent to offer the amendment in this form.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLMES. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Is it not a fact that much investigation, in fact, sufficient investigation has already been made on the Kennewick project in years gone by, and that the gentleman's amendment, instead of costing anything, will actually save \$175,000 because that \$175,000, if the gentleman's amendment is adopted, will now be used on the construction of the project. We know the project will be constructed because it is authorized.

Mr. HOLMES. That is right.

Mr. JENSEN. It is a very worthwhile project.

Mr. HOLMES. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. May I call your attention to the importance of starting construction with this money in the manner I have suggested by this amendment. When the Hanford Engineering Works came into existence in this area of the State of Washington there was taken out of production approximately 7,000 acres of irrigated land under that condemnation. This will in turn start the construction of this division, which seeks to put back into economic balance the agricultural economy of that area.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLMES. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. What is the nature of this project?

Mr. HOLMES. An irrigation and multiple-purpose project.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee will see fit to accept the amendment.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Washington made a request of me when we started on the bill this afternoon and the request was fine and quite in order. I gave him my word that I would not object to the statement which he has just made. He has made a request to shift \$175,000 from investigations to the Kennewick project. He made this request on the basis of the fact that the committee said in its report they thought this was not a new project. We did make that report but there was no money in the budget for this project. We did give our opinion that we thought it was not a new project.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. HOLMES. There was \$175,000 of investigational money allowed for this project, was there not?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes, for investigations but not for construction.

Mr. HOLMES. Would not the gentleman agree that having carried on the investigation as far as it has gone, and

we know we are capable of going ahead with construction, that the transfer of this \$175,000 which is a budget item would not in any way interfere with any other investigation and we could just as well go on with the construction of the project in the face of the fact that the committee reports they do not think this is a new project and it would not be ruled out on that basis?

Mr. KIRWAN. The gentleman from Washington is correct in that statement.

The committee made that report that they did not think it was a new project. But there is no money in the budget for construction. I, as a member of the committee, do not think that is a good thing to transfer funds for investigation purposes to start construction. If we set this precedent practically every Member who has a project in his district would ask for the same consideration.

Mr. HOLMES. Would it not be a point of importance in relation to this amendment to try in the face of the committee's opinion that it is not a new project to get this land into irrigation and under cultivation as fast as we can, to take the place of the land which was taken out by the condemnation of the Hanford Engineering Works under the war emergency? I believe that makes for a unique situation with respect to this particular amendment.

Mr. KIRWAN. I agree with what the gentleman has said. There may be several things in his favor here but there is no money requested from the budget for construction. This committee made the determination when they sat down that they were going to try to cut this bill. Many Members wanted some money for a project in their district which the committee would not allow.

Mr. HOLMES. The fact that there was no money in this bill recommended by the budget for construction is because it was ruled that it was a new project. But since the committee has disagreed with the Bureau does that not make a difference? And give the power of authorizing this money for construction?

Mr. KIRWAN. This is why the committee disagreed. They said that when the Bureau of the Budget read our report, if they do read it, then maybe next year they would come to an understanding that the Congress recognized this project as not being a new project and they would make a request for funds.

Mr. HOLMES. Because of the emergency situation caused by the great influx of population there and the condemnation that took approximately 7,000 acres of land would you not consider it a matter of wisdom without changing the over-all amount of the appropriation contained in this bill for construction in the Bureau of Reclamation that this particular transfer could be made to get these acres under construction and under irrigation?

Mr. KIRWAN. The gentleman has heard me say in the well of the House that any money that is spent on America cannot be wasted. I have that same belief and philosophy as I stand here now. But we also made an agreement in committee that we would not add any new construction money if the budget did

not see fit to ask for it. We do not think it is a new project. Next year they can come in and ask for funds. We have to keep our word with our committee as well as with the Congress and I do not want to turn around and ask to spend money to start on any new construction when we already have an ironclad agreement that we would not do so.

Mr. HOLMES. In the face of this emergency and in view of the fact that the chairman of your committee has sat in on the hearings on this particular project and the committee does not believe it a new project, would you not still think it wise to try to get this extension under way as quickly as possible, especially when it can be done so easily and readily by the transfer of these funds? It seems to me with the committee so ruling it not a new project that those funds could be authorized now for construction.

Mr. KIRWAN. I would try to get it in another body; not with a committee that already said they are not going to spend a dime on new construction.

Mr. HOLMES. What would be the purpose of trying to get it in another body when we have an opportunity to do it right here?

Mr. KIRWAN. Because the committee is objecting to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] has expired.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to this paragraph to reduce the figure on line 11, page 231. Is it necessary for me to offer it at this time as a substitute, or may I offer it after the disposition of the pending amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. In reply to the parliamentary inquiry, the Chair will have to state that if the pending amendment is not adopted, the gentleman could then offer his amendment, but if the pending amendment is adopted, then it would not be in order to offer the amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Then I offer the amendment at this time as a substitute, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order. The unanimous-consent request that was granted does not extend to others the opportunity to offer amendments to a paragraph that has not been read.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement it certainly would open the door for that to be done. Otherwise, Members who might want to increase the other amount would be prevented from doing it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That was exactly why I raised the question I did at the time the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HOLMES] offered his amendment. I am sure the RECORD will show that I raised that question at the time. It occurred to me that once this figure was changed, it could not subsequently be changed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota asked the gentleman from Washington a question about

his amendment. The Chair did not reply to it. The gentleman from Washington made reply to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is correct. His reply was that it did not change the figure in the next paragraph.

Mr. HOLMES. I am sorry I must have misunderstood you. I said in the succeeding section and I understood you to say the next succeeding section.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Had he said it would change the figure in the next paragraph, I was contemplating raising the very question which has now come up.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. Is this not the situation: If the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HOLMES] should be adopted, then no further amendment changing the figure in the paragraph beginning on line 8, page 231, would be in order?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEATING to the amendment offered by Mr. HOLMES: On page 231, line 11, strike out "\$297,467,000" and insert "\$240,391,125."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized in support of his amendment to the amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, this amendment at least has the merit of simplicity. I realize that it will probably be vigorously opposed. It does simply this: It reduces the amount for construction of reclamation projects 25 percent below the budget estimates; not below the amount in the bill, \$297,000,000, but below the budget estimate, \$320,000,000. It cuts \$80,000,000 from the budget figures, but only \$57,000,000 from the bill before us.

This omnibus bill contains reductions below the requests submitted by the Corps of Engineers for rivers and harbors and flood control projects amounting to 25 percent, but there was a reduction in the reclamation projects of only 7 percent. I see no reason for making any such distinction. There is nothing sacrosanct about the amounts allowed for the activities of either of these Government agencies. No doubt, every Member has one or more projects in his district which he would like to see advanced as quickly as possible. But it seems to me that if there was ever a time in the financial history of our Nation that we needed to view this problem with our minds focused on the over-all picture rather than on our own individual local problems, that time is now.

The continuation year after year of deficit financing and our plunge deeper and deeper into the sea of red ink presents to me an extremely disturbing picture. If this were happening to us in our own business or our own family, we would be lying awake nights worrying about how we could ever make ends meet. Ours is the responsibility to bend every conceivable effort to see that the Federal

cloth is cut to fit the pattern, which can mean only one thing, reductions all along the line, painful as they may be.

Specifically, if the financial condition of this country were different, it might be prudent to bring about equalization between the engineer projects and the reclamation projects by an across-the-board increase in the former. But certainly, in the face of our national debt of over a quarter of a trillion dollars—a new word on which Uncle Sam has an exclusive copyright—in the face of the added fact that we are confronted with the sobering realization that the tragic state of our finances is bound to be worse before it is better, it seems to me the prudent course for us is to make at least as great a reduction in the provision for reclamation projects as the Appropriations Committee has made in the civil functions bill on projects handled by the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. Do I understand that the gentleman's reduction will be applied as a 25 percent reduction straight across the board?

Mr. KEATING. I do not think I am in a position to decide that question. I notice that in the proposed reductions which are set forth on page 170 of the report the Interior Department has not done that to date; in other words, they have not made a 7 percent reduction across the board; they have reduced some projects more than 7 percent; they have left others just as they are. How they have determined where to cut and where not to cut is something that is entirely beyond my knowledge.

The result of the adoption of this amendment would be that 25 percent less than the budget estimates would be available for all phases of this particular activity.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. The Missouri Valley item was reduced 10 percent; the rest of the item from this bill for reclamation was scarcely touched. I offered an amendment in the full committee to bring the rest of the items in line with the cut which was made for the Missouri Valley and was roundly whipped by the members of the opposition. But I want the gentleman to understand that I have possibly a better economy record than has the gentleman who has offered this amendment. I also want him to understand that I resent his taking upon himself the privilege of offering this amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield further. I am sorry that the gentleman feels as he does.

Mr. JENSEN. I say that because the gentleman knows exactly nothing about it.

Mr. KEATING. I refuse to yield further; I am very sorry.

Mr. JENSEN. And you are not running my business.

Mr. KEATING. I am very sorry the gentleman feels as he does.

Mr. JENSEN. I helped cut out of this bill \$47,000,000 in committee.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield further.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield further.

The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. JENSEN. And you are not running my committee.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. I may say to the gentleman from Iowa that I have the highest regard for him and the splendid record he has made for economy in this Congress. I appreciate all that he has done. I commend him for it. I realize that perhaps his interests or his views at times may not coincide with mine. I hope he will accord me the same sincerity of purpose which I am very happy to accord to him. I assure him that I am not trying to interfere with his fine service on this important committee. If his conscience dictates opposition to this amendment, that is his decision which I would be the last to criticize. I trust he will equally recognize my privilege to take the position that my sense of duty dictates.

I feel that it would be only fair to treat all projects on the same basis whatever their origin. That is the effect of my amendment.

Mr. JENSEN. But you are not doing it. You have taken 35 percent out of the Missouri Valley project. I have got around 100,000 acres of land out there right now lying under water because we have not had necessary flood-control funds, and now you are proposing to take 25 percent off the rest of them.

Mr. KEATING. My amendment is not directed to any particular project. It is an over-all figure of 25 percent and involves only the total figure contained in the budget estimate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in not to exceed 5 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

DESIGNATION OF AMERICAN STUDENT NURSE DAYS, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate

consideration of House Joint Resolution 455.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas in the nursing profession, which provides one of the vital health services of the Nation, there is a continuing shortage of registered professional nurses; and

Whereas in order to provide adequate numbers of graduate nurses in future years, 50,000 new students should be enrolled in schools of professional nursing in 1950: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That in order to emphasize the needs of hospitals and health services for additional nurses, and to direct attention to the satisfaction of careers in nursing and the opportunities for service to humanity within this profession, the 6th and 7th days of May 1950 be designated American Student Nurse Days.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JULIUS ZAFFARENI — VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 581)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning herewith, without my approval, H. R. 1481, a bill for the relief of the estate of Julius Zaffareni.

The bill would direct the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to the estate of Julius Zaffareni, a Work Projects Administration employee, late of Boston, Mass., the sum of \$2,559.05. This payment would be in full settlement of all claims of the estate against the United States arising out of Mr. Zaffareni's death on November 16, 1939, when he was killed by a backing truck operated by another Work Projects Administration employee. The bill recites the fact that the same amount had been awarded as damages and costs to the estate by a Massachusetts State court on July 29, 1941, in a suit against the truck driver, and that this judgment remains unsatisfied because of the defendant's inability to pay. Under the terms of the bill, this sum would be payable only upon the assignment to the United States of all rights of the estate under such judgment.

It appears from the files of the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, which administers the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, that when the fatal injuries were inflicted upon the decedent by the negligent act of his fellow employee, the decedent was in the performance of his duty, and that the case was therefore one cognizable under the Compensation Act. Under the terms of that act, however, compensation for death, except burial expenses, is payable only to certain classes of dependents specified in the act.

On June 15, 1940, a claim for compensation was filed on behalf of Sabina Loriso, who is said to be the only surviving sister and heir-at-law of the de-

cedent and is the administratrix of his estate. The claim could not be allowed, both because there was no showing that she was dependent for support upon the employee at the time of his death and because she was married, married brothers and sisters being excluded from benefits. It appears, however, that a burial payment of \$200 was made under the Compensation Act to the undertaking firm which had conducted the funeral of the decedent.

The report of the Senate Judiciary Committee—Senate Report No. 1459—indicates that the Congress based its action in passing this bill upon the judicial finding of negligence in the State court proceedings, and upon the premise that if the accident had occurred after the effective date of the Federal Tort Claims Act—January 1, 1945—the claimant could have sued and collected against the Government and that, therefore, to deny relief in this case would be an arbitrary avoidance of a just obligation.

It would seem, however, that in basing the bill on these premises the Congress overlooked the vital fact that the fatal injuries suffered by this Government employee occurred during the performance of his duties, and that the Congress has provided a carefully designed system of workmen's compensation to cover such injuries and deaths regardless of the question of negligence and has designated the classes of persons who should be beneficiaries and the conditions which they must meet in order to qualify as such. The basic principle of the United States Employees' Compensation Act in this respect was to provide compensation to those persons who were dependent upon the deceased and were deprived by his death of a means of support, not to accord a monetary award for grief or mental suffering or other damages for which compensation may be awarded in a State court proceeding.

The Congress also appears to have overlooked the recent enactment of Public Law 357, Eighty-first Congress, providing, in substance, that the liability of the United States to persons entitled to receive benefits under the provisions of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act shall be exclusive and in lieu of any other liability to such persons under other applicable Federal statutes. While it is true that this limitation, which also applies with respect to most of the State workmen's compensation laws, was not a part of the Compensation Act at the time of this accident, such limitation was unnecessary since the Government could not then be sued in tort.

In my opinion, the Congress acted wisely in removing any cause for doubt as to the exclusiveness of the remedy afforded by this act to Federal personnel. In view of the blanket coverage which is provided by this legislation, it is reasonable to conclude that these employees have, by entering the Federal service, waived rights to which other persons not so employed are entitled. They have, in other words, relinquished any right of action against the United States which might accrue to them as a result of injury or death sustained

during the course of Federal employment, in exchange for the assured and orderly protection, independent of the question of fault or negligence, which the Federal Employees' Compensation Act affords not only to such employees but also to their surviving dependents in case of death. This view is supported by the legislative history of Public Law 357, Eighty-first Congress.

No sound reason is perceived why, under similar circumstances, the foregoing principle should not apply to the legislative as well as the judicial process.

Accordingly, I have withheld my approval from this bill.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 3, 1950.

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Without objection, the bill and the accompanying message will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

There was no objection.

HOURLY MEETING

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on tomorrow at 11 o'clock a. m., and that when the House adjourns on tomorrow it adjourn to meet on Friday at 11 o'clock a. m.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there are some committees of this House that have very important matters before them. When the House convenes at 11 o'clock every day it simply means that these committees cannot get their work done. I certainly do not like to put myself in the position of going against the will of the leadership, but I know that our committee has had very little time in which to do the job we have to do. If we are going to meet at 11 o'clock every day it will probably be a very long time before we get any tax measure out of the committee, and I know the membership of this House is very much concerned about the long time it has taken to get that bill out. I am wondering whether or not some arrangement could not be made so that this appropriation measure would not stifle all other important legislation at this session of the Congress. It seems that this one-package appropriation bill has upset the procedure that has been in existence in this House for many, many years, and I think it is a detriment to the enactment of legislation which we could properly class as "must" legislation. I seriously doubt whether this unanimous-consent request should be granted, but not having talked the matter over with the leadership at this time, I will not object. I hope, however, that he confines his request to tomorrow only, though.

Mr. McCORMACK. As a matter of fact, after conferring with my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], I was going to confine my unanimous consent request to tomorrow. Of course, my friend from Pennsylvania realizes, as one of the responsible leaders of the House, being a democratic member of the Committee on

Ways and Means, that the leadership knows that he always cooperates, and I compliment the gentleman. Of course, we are not meeting every day at 11 o'clock, and the leadership would not do this unless there were urgent reasons. We have to consider a certain number of reorganization plans under the law, and the leadership is under a trying situation. We have certain responsibilities to carry out, and we have got to get these reorganization plans up on or before May 23, and it is imperative that we do so because the law provides for it. The leadership, I am sure my friend from Pennsylvania will admit, is very tolerant and understanding.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, it seems to me that the Committee on Appropriations, by having priority on this so-called one package appropriation bill, has practically taken over the leadership of the House insofar as legislation is concerned. We are not able to consider any legislation unless we have the consent of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and that has been true for the past 3 weeks and probably will be true for the next 2 or 3 weeks. I want to call attention to that fact so that the leadership is not taken away from the Speaker and the majority leader, in cooperation with the minority leader. I do not want the leadership taken away from those three gentlemen.

Mr. McCORMACK. I appreciate that, but I assure my friend that that is not so.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Further reserving the right to object, the majority leader will admit that he is not able to bring in legislation unless the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations gives up his priority insofar as that bill is concerned.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, with the appropriation bill up, there would be no other legislation that would be brought up anyway.

Mr. EBERHARTER. And there never will be if we meet at 11 o'clock every morning. We met one week practically every day at 11 o'clock and as the result the committees could not work, unless they sneaked away in the afternoon, and as a result we are not here on the floor to vote on amendments.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my unanimous consent request.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet tomorrow at 11 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, unfortunately I have business in the interest of my constituents tomorrow morning, and I cannot be here at 11. Being all alone here, being neither a member of the Republican Party nor the Democratic Party, I have got to look out for myself and my constituents. So, therefore, I object.

AMENDMENT OF THE HATCH ACT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House

confer on the bill (H. R. 1243) to amend the Hatch Act may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement on that bill. I may say that the probabilities are that this conference report will be considered the first thing tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

OHIO SWISS CHEESE

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, on April 4, 1950, my friend, Representative LAWRENCE H. SMITH of Wisconsin, inserted an article entitled "Monroe Issues Challenge" in the RECORD. The good citizens of Monroe were enraged over the criticism given of Wisconsin Swiss cheese by Bill Jones in the Minneapolis-Tribune in which he claimed that Ohio Swiss cheese was far better than that made in Wisconsin. Last week, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] challenged me to a "taste test" between Wisconsin and Ohio cheese. This test is to be made in the House dining room on Friday, May 19. As representative of the Sixteenth District of Ohio, composed of Holmes, Stark, and Tuscarawas Counties, where almost all of the 32 Ohio Swiss cheese plants are located, and on behalf of the Ohio Swiss Cheese Association and its members, I proudly accept the challenge made by my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin, with full faith that the distinctive flavor of Ohio Swiss will whet the appetite of my colleagues here assembled and cause them to vote unanimously in favor of our product.

The Ohio Swiss Cheese Association has sent to me a wheel of its cheese. This wheel was made by Mr. John Schneider, of the Ragersville Dairy and his assistant, Mr. Carlos Meeks. I believe that you Members will be interested in the story of Ohio Swiss cheese manufacture. Sugarcreek, situated about 12 miles west of New Philadelphia, is the Swiss cheese capital of Ohio and compares in that position with Monroe, Wis. There are a total of 32 cheese factories in Ohio as of April 1950, with 8 factories within a 9-mile radius of Sugarcreek. The Ohio Swiss Cheese Association has as members 27 of these 32 factories. Three of the remaining 5 produce cheese full time, while the other 2 make cheese only during the surplus milk months in the summer. Ohio, at the present time, ranks third in Swiss cheese production and makes approximately one-tenth of the Nation's total production. At one time, Ohio was second but recently has lost out to Illinois. Wisconsin is in first place. The amount produced by each State in 1948 is as follows: Wisconsin, 43,192,000 pounds; Illinois, 10,372,000 pounds, and Ohio, 7,000,000 pounds. The total United States production is 70,665,000 pounds. There are only three Swiss cheese factories east of Ohio, all of them in

Pennsylvania. In Ohio, Tuscarawas County is generally considered the focal point of the industry, but Holmes County has 11 factories to Tuscarawas County's 9. Swiss cheese making in Ohio is confined entirely to Tuscarawas, Holmes, Wayne, Stark, and Coshocton Counties.

As can be seen from the production records, Ohio can never compete with Wisconsin in quantity; but quality and flavor are two other things. It is generally felt in Ohio and by men who know both States well, that Swiss cheese produced in Ohio is in general a higher quality product than that produced in Wisconsin and in Illinois. Ohio cheese is not, however, sold in as many places as Wisconsin cheese because of the large demand for Ohio cheese in its home State. Among the largest retail outlets for Ohio Swiss are Cleveland, Columbus, Cincinnati and points serviced by these cities; Pittsburgh, Erie, Indianapolis, Philadelphia, New York City, and Toledo are some of the other cities that use a large amount of Ohio Swiss. There are, of course, many other large Ohio cities that use a lot of our local product. The first Swiss cheese factory was started in Ohio more than 75 years ago when immigrants from Switzerland arrived in Tuscarawas County. The hills of Tuscarawas County are said to have closely resembled their homeland as any section of America they had seen. Originally all of the cheese makers were born in Switzerland but there are now some second generation and even some who have only indirect Swiss ancestry. However, most of the cheese makers are still "Swiss."

The Ohio Swiss Cheese Association was organized in 1918 to improve the quality and selling conditions for Ohio cheese. Each December the Association holds a "Cheese Day" meeting at which the best cheese maker of the year is selected. Other contests between Ohio producers are held annually at county fairs held at Wooster and Dover and at the Ohio State Fair. In 1940 a few factories set up another association known as the Federated Ohio Swiss Cheese Producers. The Ohio Swiss Cheese Association along with the State and Federal Government, has a full-time technician at work aiding factories in problems they may encounter in manufacture. At the present time the technician is Fred Ryser. He operates a modern laboratory in Sugarcreek and visits the various member factories regularly. Most of the Ohio factories are cooperatively owned by farmers who supply the cheese maker with milk. Only six plants are privately owned, in most cases by the cheese maker himself.

On behalf of the Ohio Swiss Cheese Association, its member dairies and all the Ohio cheese makers and the people of the Sixteenth Ohio District, I proudly accept the challenge laid down by my colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin, and I now wish to invite you all to try our Ohio Swiss which will be served in the House dining room on Friday, May 19. I leave final judgment to you, my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, whether the flavor of Ohio Swiss is better than that of Wisconsin.

FORMER OFFICER ASKS MILITARY JUSTICE BILL VETO

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a short newspaper article and a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been directed to an article that appeared in the Evening Star of May 2, wherein Capt. Robert B. Ritchie, who served for a considerable period in the Judge Advocate General Corps in Germany, has requested the President to veto a military-justice bill that was recently approved by the House and Senate, the bill being H. R. 4080.

In order to get this matter before the House, I am asking unanimous consent that I may include the newspaper article, also a copy of the letter directed to the President of the United States, wherein Captain Ritchie calls attention to what he believes to be defects in this bill. He points out that in his judgment the legislation does not reach the objective intended by the Congress. The newspaper article and letter follow:

FORMER OFFICER ASKS MILITARY-JUSTICE BILL VETO

A former Army legal officer asked President Truman today to veto the military justice bill so that several vicious features of the measure might be corrected by Congress.

Capt. Robert B. Ritchie, who served in the Judge Advocate General Corps in Berlin until leaving the service on March 31, wrote the President that the bill passed last week falls short of its aim to improve the military court-martial system.

Congress, he declared, was on the right track in trying to lessen the power of the chain of military command over courts martial. It made headway in efforts to eliminate the danger of improper influence by high-ranking officers in appointments and deliberations, he said.

But the provision for a civilian court of appeals and the over-all section specifying penalties for violation of the general act would not provide sufficient safeguards, Captain Ritchie declared.

"The Judge Advocate General," he explained, "has the authority to increase the work load of the court at will by ordering cases sent to it. Thus he can influence the court by harassing it; or if the court should not have enough business, he can influence it by throwing it enough work to justify its existence."

"None of these influences would exist if the Judge Advocate was required to go to the court by certiorari."

Captain Ritchie, who lives in Wichita, Kans., said a more serious defect in the bill is that it would take away from the Army and Air Force personnel the long-standing right to demand trial. Under the present system, in many cases, they may agree to accept nonjudicial punishment, or may insist on a court martial.

WICHITA, KANS., April 28, 1950.

The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: After my separation from the Army March 31 as a captain in the Judge Advocate General Corps I completed my study of H. R. 4080, now before you for veto consideration, and submitted my analysis of its defects to a Member of Congress with the hope that if the bill passed

without substantial change, amendments necessary to make it carry out the congressional intent would be affected. Unfortunately this effort was unsuccessful. I now submit in abbreviated form the mentioned defects to you for consideration:

1. Congress, rather than establish an independent judicial system for the armed services, which it thought was desirable but impractical, formulated, to overcome improper domination of courts martial, two devices. These were article 98, thought to make it a penalty to violate article 37, prohibiting unlawful influencing of court members, and article 67, believed to establish a civilian-composed Court of Military Appeals free from the possibility of military control or influence. Neither device performs its intended function, because—

(a) Article 37 is not a provision regulating the proceedings before, during, or after trial of an accused.

(b) The Judge Advocate General has the authority to increase the work load of the court at will by ordering cases sent to it. Thus he can influence the court by harassing it, or if the court should not have enough business, as may happen, he can influence it by doing it the favor of throwing it enough work to justify its existence. Neither of these influences would exist, if the Judge Advocate General was required to go to the court by certiorari, the method in all cases except those involving high-ranking officers and death penalties.

2. Following are three other vicious features of the bill:

(a) Article 15 takes away from Army and Air Force personnel the law prescribed protection of the right to demand trial rather than to submit to nonjudicial punishment because the Navy felt it could not maintain discipline aboard ship unless it had the right to confine a man on bread and water without trial. This right is unnecessary if it understands and uses properly the judicial punishment system.

(b) Articles 3 and 43, when combined, would permit many individuals formerly subject to military law to be brought back into the service and tried for practically any offense at any time during their natural life, because all offenses are punishable by at least life imprisonment—"as a court martial may direct"—and the statute of limitations may be tolled by filing charges in a nonpublic office.

Since the defects pointed out above result probably from a failure to consider details, and since they can be easily corrected, I recommend to you, Mr. President, that the bill be vetoed.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT BOWLAND RITCHIE.

TEACHERS' SALARIES

Mr. IRVING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an article from Liberty magazine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. IRVING. Mr. Speaker, in addressing the Members of the House today on what in my opinion is one of the most important problems facing our country today, it is my earnest desire to call to their attention a piece of legislation that will do much to rectify a very serious condition. The bill I refer to is H. R. 5939, introduced by the gentleman from Ohio, Congressman Tom BURKE, and known as the teachers' salary bill. It provides for Federal assistance in such a manner that it in nowise could be

considered controversial or discriminatory except by those who might be opposed to providing a better education for the children of our Nation through Federal aid.

For those Members who perhaps have not had the opportunity to become familiar with the critical situation now existing in this field I recommend and solicit their reading of the following article which appeared in the May issue of Liberty magazine which I intend to include at the conclusion of my remarks. We of the House Committee on Education and Labor who have been working so diligently on this subject know of the great need for this legislation as well as the serious need for assistance for other phases of this broad problem. Yesterday I called your attention to some of those in the extension of my remarks on pages A3211 and A3212 of the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

While I appreciate that the subcommittee of which I am a member has been working continuously for many weeks drafting and perfecting the necessarily complex bills 7940 and 8113 which deal with a small but very important portion of this over-all problem and which are now practically ready for the full committee's consideration and action, I urge the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI], the chairman of this great committee, along with the chairman of its various subcommittees to postpone any conflicting meetings or any others that might interfere with immediate and full consideration of and with the definite view in mind of getting these vitally needed pieces of legislation—H. R. 7940, 8113, and 5939—to the floor of the House for speedy passage.

Mr. Speaker, it certainly is not my intention or wish to create the erroneous impression that these gentlemen have not in every way given full cooperation along with much of their valuable time. However, I feel that more encouragement to all of us to work harder, giving our full attention to these specific bills, would be of great value.

I am sure that the President is very much in favor of such a program as I have outlined and I cannot too strongly urge your full support. I have been deeply interested in the proposition that all of our children whom we must realize are our future citizens and leaders be given an opportunity for good educations. Also that those giving their lives to the teaching of these children be treated fairly and equitably so that they may live and enjoy a life more nearly commensurate with their worth to our society.

In a democracy it is essential that our youth get the kind of education that will prepare them for responsible citizenship. The American way of life will grow and flourish only as we maintain a strong system of education.

[From Liberty magazine]

WE ARE STARVING OUR TEACHERS

(By Benjamin Fine)

(America's future depends on the schooling our children get today. Yet we pay schoolteachers less than rat exterminators; less than charwomen and garbage collectors.

In this article Liberty presents the shocking truth about teachers' salaries.)

Let's begin by being brutally frank about it.

We are starving our teaching profession. We aren't paying our teachers a living wage.

Our teachers' low salaries have become a national disgrace. We are weakening our democratic way of life because we are unwilling to pay our teachers enough to make them want to teach. Hundreds of thousands of them are constantly in debt, trying to make ends meet. Many communities pay their garbage collectors more than their teachers. It is not unusual to find the street cleaners, prison cooks, dog catchers, and comfort-station attendants getting more than teachers. Policemen, firemen, bus drivers, and other city workers are financial aristocrats compared to classroom instructors.

The average teacher today gets \$2,880 a year—just about \$55 a week. That sounds like a lot of money compared to her prewar salary. But inflationary costs have cut into her purchasing power. The \$55 of 1950 is not worth as much as \$40 was in 1940.

Two hundred thousand teachers in the United States make less than \$35 a week now. Half this number get less than \$30. Some teachers get as little as \$10 a week. Could you hire a dog catcher for that salary?

Here are some painful facts to mull over: Three out of every four teachers in Mississippi get less than \$30 a week. One out of every two gets less than that in Kentucky, Arkansas, Georgia, and North Dakota. In 10 States—Arkansas, Georgia, Kansas, Kentucky, Mississippi, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Tennessee, and South Carolina—one out of every two teachers gets less than \$35 a week.

But that isn't all. In a survey I made for the New York Times not long ago, I found that the minimum wages paid teachers are fantastically small. For example, some teachers are getting as little as \$450 a year in Nebraska, \$500 in Mississippi, \$524 in Kentucky, \$696 in Tennessee, \$700 in Arkansas, and \$900 in Alabama.

With the cost of eggs, butter, meat, and coffee being what it is, how can you live on \$450 a year (\$8.65 a week) or even \$500 (\$9.62 a week)?

"I can't hire a decent janitor for that," a school superintendent said plaintively. "How can I get a teacher to work at starvation wages?"

It just doesn't make sense.

Here's a letter that a teacher wrote his county superintendent.

"DEAR SIR: I don't think I'll teach any more. I'm now earning \$8.25 weekly. I can't get married on that. I reckon I'll go to work on the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad. They pay section hands \$7 a day.

"If you can pay more, write me. I like to teach. If not, I'll be over Tuesday with the books and blackboard."

The implications are startling. From 8 to 12 years of their formative period our children are in constant contact with their teachers. No one in our community—not even bus drivers, policemen, or firemen—plays such an important role in molding the minds of youth. The shape our country will be in tomorrow depends upon the schooling our kids get today.

I spoke to the chairman of the board of education in a small town not long ago. "What do you pay your teachers?" I asked. He called in the business manager and was informed it was \$25 a week.

"Why, that's impossible!" he exclaimed. "My office boy gets more than that!"

Teachers get less money than members of any other recognized profession. They are far below, in average earnings, members of the medical, dental, engineering, and law professions. They make less than the aver-

age newspaperman does, or the average truck driver. Oftentimes they make less than unskilled laborers; they rarely make as much as a carpenter, plumber, electrician, or bricklayer.

In 1948, for example, the average net remuneration in medicine was \$11,300; and for civil engineers in private industry, \$9,000. Dentists earned \$7,039. The teacher's average salary in the United States for 1948 was \$2,500, or less than a fourth of that of the medical profession. In 1943 all manufacturing employees earned an average of \$3,040, compared with about \$2,500 for teachers.

In New York City, building construction workers get more than \$5,000 a year. Teachers start at \$2,500, and reach \$5,000, if they are lucky, after 15 years of service.

Maybe that is why most of the 75,000 teachers in New York State—where salaries are among the highest in the country—have to work on the side to supplement their income. Just listen: One man sold cemetery lots to pay his bills. Another took a job in a hotel scrubbing floors. Teachers hold all kinds of part-time jobs: truck drivers, welders, shoe salesmen, florists, ticket sellers, real-estate salesmen, carpenters, milkmen, waiters, cooks, barbers, and chambermaids. Sixty former teachers in Chicago took jobs as waitresses or dice-game girls—and earned from \$36 to \$70 a week, plus meals.

Perhaps it's not bad to work in your spare time, but what about your professional growth? You just don't have time to serve as a barber from 6 to 12, as one teacher did, if you're in the classroom from 9 to 3, and expect to keep up with modern-teaching methods.

If your salary for teaching is \$60 a month, and school is open only 6 months of the year, you may find it tough living on \$360 for 12 months. Maybe you, too, would feel puzzled, as did the country school teacher in Copiah County, Mississippi.

"What do you do the rest of the time when you are not teaching?" the Mississippi miss was asked.

"The last four summers I worked, beginning the last of March until June, at a factory," she replied. "We made containers for vegetables."

After a moment's pause she said wryly, "I make more in 1 week in the factory than I make in a month teaching."

The obvious question comes to mind: Why does she continue to teach?

"Teaching is my profession," she replied with dignity. "I would rather teach than do anything else."

When a teacher earns more making vegetable containers than she does teaching children, just what is her profession anyway? Is she a teacher or a vegetable-container maker? Not long ago a teacher in West Virginia, earning \$178 a month—not enough to keep himself and family in food and clothes—was suspended for digging coal on the side. He made \$320 a month for his part-time job. And when a Brooklyn war veteran, getting \$50 a week for teaching, found that he needed the \$60 a week he made as a bartender in the evening hours, his social status, and even his job, was endangered. But what about the Tennessee school principal who worked Saturdays as a grocery clerk, or the teacher who hired himself out as a cotton picker? Can they carry full-time jobs on the side and still expect to be good teachers?

A Buffalo teacher gave a frank answer. After 30 years in the profession, he can't support his wife and two children on the \$50 he takes home weekly.

"I make more selling vacuum cleaners than I do teaching," he confessed, "but my teaching suffers."

When we pay shoe salesmen and charwomen more than we do our teachers, we are not getting the best brains for our chil-

dren. Our schools are the very cornerstone of our democracy. Let's not chip away at the corners.

A Nation-wide survey conducted by Liberty shows the vast gap that exists between salaries paid to teachers and those paid to other city employees. In virtually every one of the Nation's largest cities, rookie policemen, firemen, as well as transit workers and garbage collectors, get a higher beginning salary than do teachers.

Now, it may well be that our large cities couldn't get along without policemen, firemen, transit workers, and garbage collectors. But can we get along without adequately trained teachers? Unless we are willing to pay teachers at least as much as we do garbage collectors, we can't expect to get our best youth to enter the teaching profession.

Here are beginning salaries for policemen, firemen, transit workers, garbage collectors, and teachers in 15 of our largest cities—a shameful eye-opener for all of us:

City	Policemen	Firemen	Transit workers	Garbage collectors	Teachers
New York.....	\$3,150	\$3,150	\$2,979	\$3,250	\$2,500
Chicago.....	3,012	3,012	3,224	2,756	2,500
Philadelphia.....	4,024	2,944	3,692	2,643	2,400
Detroit.....	3,257	3,257	4,400	3,037	3,046
Cleveland.....	2,748	2,640	3,600	3,070	2,700
Baltimore.....	2,600	2,700	3,619	2,845	2,600
St. Louis.....	3,144	3,144	2,240	2,580	2,400
Boston.....	2,800	2,800	3,120	2,613	2,484
Pittsburgh.....	2,979	2,979	3,224	2,912	2,200
San Francisco.....	3,420	3,420	3,759	4,368	2,700
Minneapolis.....	3,036	3,036	3,162	3,016	2,400
Houston, Tex.....	2,700	2,700	3,772	2,496	2,403
Seattle.....	3,120	3,120	3,390	3,575	2,600
Louisville, Ky.....	2,400	2,400	3,350	2,600	2,400
Milwaukee.....	3,300	3,300	3,500	3,096	2,807
Average.....	2,983	2,977	3,400	2,990	2,609

What a grave indictment. Virtually every one of our largest cities pay policemen, firemen, transit workers, and garbage collectors more than teachers. The entering teacher gets, in our largest cities, an average salary of \$2,609. But the garbage collector can count on \$2,990.

Of course, through annual increments of \$100 to \$150 a year, the teachers' salaries frequently pull away from the collectors of garbage. But it takes long years of preparation to be a teacher. In each of the cities reached by Liberty, the teacher is required to have at least a 4-year college education before she gets her certificate. It is doubtful whether that is expected of garbage collectors or even the higher-paid bus or subway drivers.

If teachers' salaries are so out of line in the large cities, what about the small rural communities, or the cities and towns below 25,000 population? Here we find the salaries even more pitifully inadequate. To quote but a few instances: Teachers in Stuttgart, Ark., get \$1,230 a year; in Madisonville, Ky., \$1,329; Van Buren, Maine, \$1,631; Aberdeen, Miss., \$1,080; and Ripley, Tenn., \$1,427.

How can a teacher live on \$20 or \$25 a week and expect to keep up with modern educational practices, dress well, and serve as a model to the youth of the community? Does it make sense that tens of thousands of teachers get paid less than garbage collectors and rat exterminators?

Maybe that is why the superintendent in a Georgia rural-school system got this puzzling letter of complaint from one of his teachers: "Dear Sir: When I since [signed?] up Wednesday I was to since up for four check and I just since up for two check and that made four time for me too. If this don't go to the write place send it on to the one to—and since you up. Ever two week. I don't you to since me my other checks to me be—

cause the money is hard to made for me not to get them so sense them out to me at once.

"P. S.—Answer real soon."

The disturbed board officials finally puzzled out what the teacher meant: She had received only two checks in 4 months. Dr. John I. Allman, Georgia's deputy State superintendent of schools, pronto sent her the missing two checks. Perhaps she could continue to teach reading and arithmetic, but could she be entrusted to teach writing to the young trustful souls under her care?

"We have no control over her," explained Dr. Allman. Then he added wistfully, "Perhaps she is the best they can get for \$67.50 a month."

If we pay a teacher \$15 or \$16 a week we'll get our money's worth all right. It's a wonder the Georgia teacher could write at all.

I have seen teachers who couldn't. Not far from Detroit I met a \$35-a-week teacher who boasted of the lacing he gave one of his students: "He won't get out of bed for a week." And then he added, "If I can't larn 'em, I wham 'em." Or how would you like your child to be taught by the female ancient mariner come to life who told her pupils in a Rocky Mountain State, "Wait till the women get the right to vote in this country. We'll show the men how to run it."

The present salaries cannot possibly bring the best minds into the teaching profession. When a college graduate can enter business, industry, or the Government at a higher salary than he can the teaching profession, why shouldn't he take the better-paying job? A recent study shows that teachers are the lowest paid among the Colgate graduates, while those in industry are the highest. Teachers in the class of 1928 averaged \$4,105, while men in industry made \$12,510 annually. Graduates of the class of 1938 showed a similar disparity: Those who graduated 12 years ago and went into industry are now making \$6,144 each; those who went into teaching are making \$3,513. It has been estimated that a teacher has 1 chance in 2,500 to earn \$10,000 or more a year, and 1 chance in 400 to earn \$7,500 or more.

Indeed, New York, the richest State in the Union, illustrates the disparity that exists between salaries paid to teachers and those received by other professions. This table shows the entering annual salaries of several groups:

Engineer, \$2,898.
Economist, \$2,898.
Statistician, \$3,036.
Architect, \$3,450.
Insurance examiner, \$3,846.
Bank examiner, \$4,242.
Physician, \$4,636.
Teacher, \$2,500 (\$2,700 with M. A. degree).

Again we find the teacher on the lowest rung of the financial ladder.

A survey of 169 well-known industrial concerns by the Northwestern University's bureau of placement estimates that the average salaries for college graduates this year will be \$245 a month. Beginning engineers will get \$260; sales personnel, \$240; accountants, \$238; general business trainees, \$234; and those in other fields, \$252. Teachers will get \$185 a month.

Alarmed at this trend, the High School Teachers Association of New York City warned: "Teachers who are forced to pinch pennies to maintain a decent professional standard of living certainly will not be enthusiastic about recommending the teaching profession to capable young people."

Perhaps that is why one-third of all the teachers of the Nation said, in answer to a questionnaire: "I would not recommend that my bright students go into teaching." Or why one mother said bitterly, "I'd break my son's neck if he decided to become a teacher. It's bad enough that his dad is in this racket."

The low teaching salary is the most important reason for the growing teacher crisis. This year our teaching training institutions will prepare less than 20,000 elementary school teachers. We will need 100,000. During the next 10 years the Nation will need 1,000,000 teachers—and will have one-fifth that number available. How can you expect the bright students to go into teaching if they can start at a higher salary in almost any other profession?

During the war and postwar years 350,000 teachers, many of them the best in the profession, deserted the classroom for better-paying jobs. Sometimes a small rural school may have five or six teachers come and go in 1 year. Of course, some teachers stick because of loyalty to their students and because they love teaching. A southern teacher with 14 years' experience, now getting \$886 a year, gave this reason for remaining on the job:

"I enjoy working with children and feel that I am making a worth-while contribution to my community. Otherwise I would have left the teaching profession long ago."

Only recently the southern schoolma'am said she was offered a position as a maid for an elderly lady which would have paid her considerably more than she's now getting as a teacher. She didn't quit although, in her own words, "Almost any position I might get as waitress, cook, factory worker, or beauty-parlor assistant would pay me more money than I am now making teaching school."

Listen to the testimony of Mrs. Marie R. Turner, superintendent of Breathitt County schools, Jackson, Ky., who appeared before the House Education Committee last June, where she testified in behalf of Federal aid for schools:

"We are able to pay our best-qualified teachers—on a 12-month basis—\$118 a month. Our least-qualified teachers earn \$70 a month. As a result we are not holding our more capable teachers, nor are we attracting new material of the best caliber."

This is a real problem. Until we pay teachers as much as we pay others for less important jobs, we'll not get competent teachers.

Everywhere the story is the same: The American teacher is being sold short. She is not getting enough to attract our best brains. If we cheat our teachers, we cheat our children too. Then society is the loser.

In a democracy it is essential that our youth get the kind of education that will prepare them for responsible citizenship. The American way of life will grow and flourish only as we maintain a strong system of education. Underpaid teachers will mean undereducated boys and girls. As the richest Nation in the world we can afford to pay our teachers a decent living wage. Let's throw away our peanuts attitude, and encourage the best among our citizens to become teachers.

Without good teachers we will not have good schools. And without good schools our democracy is endangered.

THE SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

GLOOMY OBSERVANCE

MR. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, today, wherever there beats a Polish heart, we can be sure it is more keenly attuned to the ever-present thought of liberty because May 3 marks the anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution 159 years ago. It is Poland's national holiday and to exiled Poles scattered over the globe it is a day dedicated to undiminishing hope in the ultimate

attainment of freedom for a long-suffering fatherland.

One of the greatest documents in world history, the Polish Constitution burst upon the scene in Europe in the midst of enemies who were determined to suppress this courageous and liberal venture in self-government. It was, at that time, the brightest shaft of light to penetrate the deep darkness of a continent bogged down by inequalities, serfdom and rule by the privileged class. But the forces in opposition saw to it that this exemplary and revolutionary document did not receive an opportunity of being exercised to their detriment. Soon after the unholy partnership, Russia, Germany, and Austria dismembered and plunged Poland into a period of subjugation that lasted 150 years and terminated after World War I in the achievement of independence.

What joy and hope and enthusiasm a nation reborn can know after a century and a half of slavery can scarcely be visualized. Peace and independence attained, Poland looked forward with confidence in the future and with the honest expectation that the worst of its unhappy history was a thing of the past. That this was to be but an interim, brief, elusive and fleeting as a dream, none could believe. Yet an aspirant to world domination with the first blitzkrieg descended upon Poland with full fury and ended the beautiful dream by aerial and artillery shelling that struck down men, women, and children in methodical destruction aimed at eliminating for all time a nation that had scarcely sufficient time to catch its breath and to rise to its feet after 150 years of abuse at the hands of three ruthless tyrants.

The Hitler horde pressed through in its brutal attack and gained its objective for the time. But, worse yet was the agreement Germany made with Russia to partition Poland. Engulfed, deserted, alone, and helpless, this courageous peace-loving nation was faced with extermination. It must be remembered that the promised assistance never materialized. When at long last the Nazi juggernaut had been repelled, a spark of hope was rekindled that perhaps the independence that was so criminally interrupted might again be restored. And, in spite of the terrific cost, the winning of freedom seemed to be worth the price. The word of the Allies was the guaranty upon which was placed unlimited faith despite all the cruel adversities and the indescribable suffering experienced. This then was the child-like faith of the Polish people. Patience and trust and belief in the ultimate resurrection of its country with the help of the United States prevailed in Poland and throughout the world wherever there exists sympathy for this most harassed of nations.

Though May 3 is here again and the world over Polish people turn their thoughts to that glorious, freedom-giving document, the Constitution of 1791, there is little cause for rejoicing, for there is no Poland where there is no freedom. In its place there is Communist brutality, aided and abetted by the grievous errors of the Yalta agreement. The

present government in Poland is the direct result of a sell-out by pro-Communist elements in our Government that guided the foreign policy of the United States at the time the infamous secret agreements were consummated. Our current programs of foreign relations are still slanted in that direction and the authors of these volatile policies wield their influence yet to the detriment of world peace.

And the pledges to Poland lie forgotten.

History can do nothing other than to saddle the United States with the accusation that it eliminated one enemy of Poland and invited another to take its place. This truth will become increasingly prominent as the Russian bear with its grasping, clawing paws reaches out to embrace more and more territory. Nations are falling before the military and diplomatic onslaughts of the Communists and are being absorbed into the Russian orbit the while we piddle away valuable time and condone an utterly irresponsible foreign policy that is fast leading the world toward that dreaded peace crusher—war. It must be admitted by even the most naive that Russia is extremely busy on all fronts, the diplomatic, the economic, and the military. She wastes no time but exploits every opportunity to advance her projects of eventual world domination.

The same old dream of world conquerors is shared by Joe Stalin and one would have to be stone deaf and black blind not to recognize that this ominous dream is being transformed, at this moment, into a cold, frightening and destructive reality by the Kremlin boss. Who can claim, in all honesty, that the present role of Communist Russia does not follow the time-worn pattern of subjugation. I have no patience with apologists who insist the United States does not understand Russia. What is there left to understand in the barbaric and shameless conduct of Soviet Russia whose brazen reluctance toward achievement of world peace is convincingly indicated each and every day. While we accept almost meekly the endless diplomatic and cold war shenanigans of the Kremlin our foreign policy remains sleazy, disintegrated and exposed to lampooning.

We have international responsibilities. That cannot be denied. They are serious, we all know. But we must meet the gravest of our problems—head on. Not with a chip on our shoulders. Not with any implied threats, but with realistic firmness that shall inspire a sound declaration of policy based on well-known concepts of righteousness. There are no alternate avenues by which we can reach a solution. Right is right and the mistakes made by our Red-tinted policymakers can be rectified.

I call for an unqualified repudiation of the Yalta agreement.

I entreat that a beginning be made, here and now, to pull down that wall of iron that keeps our tried and true ally, Poland, imprisoned behind it. If peace is truly the aim of Russia, then the release of Poland from its clutching grasp would entail no difficulty whatever, would clear the atmosphere of world sus-

picion and prepare the path to peace. I address myself to the Russian nation and invite its attention to this fundamental truth.

Peace is simple to achieve. Peace is possible if it is truly desired.

A start toward that goal can be made in Poland. Withdrawal of Russian forces and restoration of Polish independence would be acclaimed by the world at large. That is a clear and perfectly obvious assignment of Soviet Russia in the present cold war that is rapidly warming up to a dangerous degree. The duty of the United States in this instance is to remember the pledges made to heroic Poland, devout believer in the principles of freedom and constitutional government, and friend and ally.

The valiant people of Poland look to this country for encouragement and support in the hope that through the efforts of the United States the next observance of Polish Constitution Day will be an occasion for rejoicing in a free, happy, and prosperous country.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SADLAK. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. I wish to join the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut in his tribute today to the liberty-loving people of Poland. I hope that the Voice of America carries a complete account of his address today to those people behind the iron curtain.

Mr. SADLAK. I thank the gentleman very much.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK] has expired.

THE THIRD OF MAY

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, on this one hundred and fifty-ninth anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution—known simply by its date: The 3d of May—let us once again pause and pay tribute to that once-great nation, and reflect on its present-day tragedy.

To all Americans of Polish ancestry, and to the millions of Poles scattered throughout the continents of the world, this anniversary will always remain full of special significance. In all walks of life, in all fields of endeavor, in all conditions, they will always find inspiration and example in their forefathers' achievements and spirit, of which the Constitution of the Third of May 1791, is a worthy embodiment.

While sanguinary revolutions and upsets were marking the history of other nations through the eventful years of the eighteenth century, the Poles have peacefully and joyfully set themselves to the task of writing and adopting their great constitution, which gave to the common man of Poland the freedoms inherent in democracy. The manner in which this democratic document was born, though astounding to the rest of

the world, was merely in keeping with the tradition of the Poles who, from the earliest times, have shown deep respect for the dignity of man, and unwavering devotion to parliamentary principles.

It is well known that this enfranchisement of the Polish masses came too late to be enjoyed by them. Within a few years the third partition dismembered the old Republic, and for over a century it ceased to exist as a free nation. Yet this same spirit which motivated the adoption of the Constitution of the 3d of May, and which shaped the current of events of Poland's history, once again asserted itself as Poland gained freedom and independence in 1918.

The hour of freedom was brief. Torn between the rivalries of the East and the West, the totalitarian ambitions of her neighbors, Poland was once again dismembered, this time by the Nazis, whose reign of terror was soon to be replaced by the tragic Communist domination.

As we recall the history of Poland, and ponder over her present plight, we must ask ourselves, "How long must her people suffer?" And we must also ask ourselves, "How long must the other people suffer—the other people who also love freedom and independence, democracy and peace, and who, because of the rapacious actions of their neighbors, have already suffered so much?"

The end must come to the incessant warfare, to the oppression of the smaller nations, to bloodshed and pain, to intolerance and insatiable greed that have frustrated all the attempts at establishing peace and freedom in the world, and have brought tragedy to the lives of countless millions.

Our Nation has been, and is, working for the achievement of that goal—the thought of Poland must spur us in our efforts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I join with the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] and also the other gentlemen who have spoken on this occasion in paying honor to the great people of Poland and in properly commemorating the one hundred and fifty-ninth anniversary of the establishment of the Polish Constitution. Every student of history is aware of the great contribution made toward the progress of mankind, toward the existence of the dignity of man and of the establishment of democratic institutions of government by the people of Poland in past generations. Every student of government is well aware of the deep faith that the people have always possessed, which has been an inspiration and a strength and a guidance to them in making their great contribution to the progress of man.

The people of Poland have been through many trying periods, but they have never been defeated. The people of Poland today are undergoing another period of pain, but the great courage, as a result of the faith that the people of Poland possess, will have them emerge from this period of pain and again enjoy their independence as a nation and their

freedom as a people. Persons of all races and of all racial origins are looking forward to the day when the heel of the oppressor, the vicious dictator, is removed from the soil and the people of Poland. Once that is done the alien regime that is in there now will be very quickly hurled out and again a government "of the people, by the people, for the people," as the great Abraham Lincoln well said so many years ago, will exist in that great land abroad.

May I say to the gentlemen who have made remarks today, some of whom are Americans of Polish descent, like the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK], that the people of America are proud of the Americans of Polish blood and of the contribution they have made to the progress of our country. They have always been liberty-loving people, and they always will be, and with the help of God and the power of America we will look forward and pray for that day when the heel of the totalitarian oppressor will be removed and again liberty restored to the fine, brave people of Poland.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. I shall always remember a remarkable address made on the floor of this House on Polish Constitution Day several years ago when the now Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] paid great compliment to the liberty-loving people of Poland, and reached a great peroration when he said:

Poland's battle is our battle, and our battle is Poland's battle.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD today on Polish Constitution Day may have the privilege of extending those remarks at this point in the RECORD, and that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on this subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, today is the one hundred and fifty-ninth anniversary of the Polish Constitution, which contains her famous bill of rights.

Americans of Polish descent and Poles in all free countries today are celebrating one of the greatest Polish holidays. Not only is this anniversary commemorated by people of Polish extraction, but they are joined by all freedom-loving people throughout the world.

Over a century and a half ago Polish leaders, encouraged and inspired in part

by the American Revolution, proclaimed a new bill of rights for the Polish Nation. Many documents are of great historic significance, but the Polish Constitution is truly one of the world's great documents of freedom. I might say it was the most liberal and the most democratic of its day, and it served as an inspiration to other struggling nations to assert themselves.

The Third of May is to all Poles what the Fourth of July is to all Americans—it is a day among days. Today in the hearts of millions of true Poles, those still behind the iron curtain, and millions of our own Polish-Americans, burns the light of freedom that some day will bring to that heroic nation a new independence.

I need not recall today the glorious history of the Polish people, its record of unsurpassed valor, fearless courage, and unblemished honor. People all over the world recall Poland's magnificent heritage which has served her as a guiding light throughout all the years of her trials and tribulations. We recall that spirit which never yielded its devotion to an ideal.

Through the centuries her great leaders have given their aid and assistance to all countries which were struggling for the right of self-determination. In our own fight for independence, those men of extraordinary capabilities and courage—Pulaski, Sobieski, and Kosciuszko, as well as countless Polish patriots—contributed heavily to our victory. To them and to all the Polish people we owe an unceasing debt of gratitude.

In the present state of affairs, Poland finds herself a victim of Soviet aggression like so many other countries—in spite of the fact that in none of these countries are the Communists in a majority.

Poland was first in the fight against the German aggressor in 1939 and was justly called the inspiration of the world by President Roosevelt. Her heroic stand at that time in the face of aggression by a superior force is an example of courage unparalleled in history. She inspired freedom-loving nations and brought home to them the first realization of the Axis threat to civilization.

By thus engaging Hitler in the early days of the war, Poland prevented a surprise attack on France and England who were unprepared at the time. Had Poland compromised instead of resisting aggression, the whole course of history might have been changed.

As a faithful ally, Poland obtained the promises of the great powers that she would be free and independent, yet today she is under the yoke of another aggressor, which plans eventually to dominate the entire world.

Poland's contribution to the success of the Allied Nations during World War II and her people's struggle to preserve western civilization throughout the years make it incumbent upon us here in America to keep faith with the Polish people, especially at the present time when her long-cherished freedom is once again enslaved.

The Polish people are known as resolute people who can endure a great deal in defense of their liberty. They believe

in the principles of Christianity as opposed to Communist doctrine and practices.

Our ultimate goal, and the ultimate goal of all liberty-loving people, should be the destruction of communism, since it is a doctrine contrary to the spirit of real liberty and one which violates human rights.

Therefore, I again urge that the United States continue every effort to restore Poland to her prewar glory. We are morally obligated to render every possible assistance, both directly and through the United Nations, to help her in her underground struggle to break the chains of totalitarianism which threaten to engulf the Western World.

With the Polish people, I firmly believe that justice and democracy will eventually triumph, but I believe we must furnish concrete proof and assistance to achieve this end as soon as possible.

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, today is the one hundred and fifty-ninth anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution. It symbolizes the successful achievement of individual liberty through the untiring efforts of the Polish people.

It is appropriate that this honorable body take cognizance of the situation facing the Polish people in their effort to attain stability and independence as a nation.

History shows Poland as the battleground of Europe, torn between powerful conflicting forces surrounding her, the partitions and the frequent changes in sovereignty over the areas inhabited by Polish peoples, is well known. Polish contributions to art and science are also well known. Poland's aid, through great leaders in the cause of our own independence, has frequently been recognized by the American people. The suffering of the Polish people through the changing conditions of power politics in Europe through the centuries and the persistent courage of her people and her leaders in fighting unflinchingly against overpowering forces seeking to thwart Polish independence have aroused the admiration of mankind.

Not the least in Poland's long history of oppression and tribulations is the history of the Polish people in World War II. The world will long remember the courage of the Polish people in 1939, when they refused to submit to the unrighteous demands of the powerful Nazi war machine. The world will not forget the 1,000,000 military casualties and the 9,000,000 civilian casualties and the devastation of Polish cities and farms as armies surged back and forth across Polish territory in World War II.

The nations of the world owe an obligation to Poland and other small nations like her to make certain that the continual conflict and unrest resulting from the conflicting ambitions of power politics shall cease. A tremendous responsibility rests upon the United Nations organization to guarantee and assure the opportunity to peoples like the Poles to live their lives and enrich their existence without molestation and oppression from any source. The nations of the world owe a duty to the Po-

lish people and others similarly situated under the chaotic conditions existing in the aftermath of the war to guarantee that the people themselves shall have the right to select the kind of government they desire in a free election in which there cannot be any doubt that the results are the expression of the free will of the citizens without coercion or improper influence exerted by outside forces.

As a representative American of Polish descent I await the day when Poland will be free of the Red army bayonets that control Poland today. I await the day when freedom and democracy will be enjoyed by the Polish people as we in America are blessed.

Mr. CHESNEY. Mr. Speaker, on this May 3, 1950, we are again privileged to mark and commemorate Polish Constitution Day. It was on May 3, 1791, that Poland adopted this great document granting far-reaching freedom to her people.

Just as we Americans celebrate Independence Day on July 4 so the people of Poland would jubilantly celebrate today if it were possible for them to do so. But Poland cannot rejoice today. Russia will see that they do not but even the iron heel of Russia cannot prevent the Polish people from a silent and hopeful observance of the one hundred and fifty-ninth anniversary of their great day. Let us all hope that in the not too distant future the Polish people will again be free to openly and happily celebrate Constitution Day.

Poland has been the unfortunate battling ground of Europe in many wars. During World War I armies crossed and recrossed her land, destroying homes and fields. I believe that Poland has encountered more misery from wars than any other country in Europe.

During World War II Poland would not yield to Hitler and his barbaric hordes. Poland had the courage to stand and fight the invaders in an effort to preserve her independence. The defense of Warsaw will long be remembered as one of the monumental battles of all times. When she was defeated her brave soldiers did not surrender but fled to other lands and carried on the battle with their allies.

On the slopes of Monte Cassino thousands of these brave men gave their lives and in so doing they saved the lives of many American, British, and French soldiers. They gave their lives but their fathers, mothers, sisters, brothers, friends, and relatives did not reap the fruits of the common victory. Not for them the freedom which their allies are now enjoying—not for them the independence for which they so valiantly fought.

Let us all have faith in the future of Poland. Let us all fervently hope that she will once again proudly stand erect, side by side with the United States, free and independent, as a testimonial to an indomitable courage and unconquerable spirit which has always marked the history and background of that land of hard-fighting, liberty-loving people.

I think we should pause in the midst of our legislative business to silently pray

for the end of all aggressive global wars. If the money which has been spent for wars could be spent for the advancement and benefit of humanity this would be a good world to live in. Poland and the other nations now under the domination of Russia could once again enjoy freedom, liberty, and peace on earth.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I deem it a real privilege to stand before this microphone in this House of Representatives, to freely and under no restrictions, address the Members on the occasion of the one hundred and fifty-ninth anniversary of the Polish Constitution of May 3, adopted in 1791, by the Congress of the Republic of Poland, which was the most liberal, most democratic of its day. Upon rereading it today, one is profoundly moved at its wisdom and magnanimity which assured rights and freedom to the people of Poland.

It was in 1939, which means 11 years ago when Poland and the Polish Nation observed the so-called constitution of May 3 as a free, independent, and sovereign state, on their own soil.

Since that time the Polish Nation has suffered the consequences of war, occupation, and most severe destruction of their homeland. Since that time the great Polish Nation could not observe this memorable and historical day. Yes—11 years have elapsed since Poland went under another era of foreign control and influence.

Here—in this country—we are cognizant of the unparalleled tragedy that the Polish Nation is going through. And today on the day of the one hundred and fifty-ninth anniversary of the Constitution of Poland, we express our deep heartfelt sympathy and at the same time convey our sincere sentiments as a brotherly nation.

But, aside of the geographical and political Poland which at the present time experiences results and tactics which is so strange to her—there is another Poland—the spiritual Poland which exists, lives, and grows outside of her natural boundaries. For there is a proverb in the Polish language which in English sounds something like this: "Wherever beats Polish heart, wherever Polish blood flows, there is Poland." Yes, west of the iron curtain, there is another Poland. Just as strong physically, morally, and spiritually, as the one which is known for courage, knighthood, and untiring efforts in their pursuit for freedom, liberty, and independence. We cannot overlook the enormous contribution of the great Polish Nation in their fight to protect the western civilization and the Christian world from being overrun or even annihilated by evil forces all through the history of mankind.

And today this same nation—Poland—observes its one hundred and fifty-ninth anniversary of the constitution of May 3, which, as our own, embodies all the fundamentals of freedom, equality, and independence. And—as stated before—there is another Poland which we might as well call "west of the iron curtain Poland," which is thoroughly democratic and religious, is seeking shelter and refuge from the present "regime" set up after World War II over in Poland.

Many settlements have sprung up all over the world; many new colonies were established where our good friends, Poles, are trying to start living anew. These new settlements are becoming strong outposts of true democracy and Christianity. Many of them came to our shores, where they are enjoying our hospitality—where they are extended all the possible help in their sincere effort to adjust themselves and rehabilitate themselves according to the new conditions and customs existing in this great country of ours.

As long as I am on this subject, mention should be made about the great Polish people, whose gallant sons contributed so much to the independence, growth, and development of these United States of America. The Poles are known to us—well enough. And we know well enough that the present new generation represents just as valuable and desirable element, as the old pioneers and old Polish settlers in this land of plenty.

Today all freedom-loving Poles of two decades unite to pay tribute to their heroes, to the creators of the greatest document of its time, "The constitution of the 3d of May." All those living outside Soviet-dominated Poland assemble in order that they may on this very day express their wishes, their thoughts, their sorrows. Here, on our free and brotherly soil, we consider it an honor and privilege to join our fellow citizens of Polish descent, also all those who came to this country as DP's in their observance of this memorable day, the one hundred and fifty-ninth anniversary of the constitution of May 3.

We extend our brotherly hands to all those who so gallantly fought in the last World War, and in all the previous combat encounters in the field of freedom, and on this very day, which is today, Wednesday, May 3, 1950, convey our most sincere hope and most earnest wishes that the great Polish Nation will soon again cherish all the blessing of true freedom, liberty and sovereignty to the fullest extent.

Christianity and democracy are the most precious possessions of mankind, and no nation shall be deprived of these priceless virtues. The Constitution of Poland, often referred to as the Constitution of the 3d of May, was built upon these fundamentals. And we may assure our Polish friends that with their determination, patience, and firm belief in God, as proven by history, they shall regain and achieve complete restoration of Poland which again will take due place in the great family of Christian and democratic nations.

Permit me to stress again that the Poles in Poland of today are forbidden to observe the Third of May Constitution Day. But they are forced to participate in the May 1st day celebrations on the orders from the Kremlin.

Therefore, our commemoration of the Polish national holiday has a twofold purpose. First, to join the Polish people in their observance of the one hundred fifty-ninth anniversary of the Constitution of May the 3d; second, to express our deep sympathy to all those, who by no fault of their own, are unable to join

our ranks, and who are subjugated to a form of government which they do not like, nor approve of.

General characteristics of the Polish people are nearly the same as ours—their love of freedom, recognition of human rights, and understanding of peoples' needs are the same as ours. Our conception of Christianity and democracy—is no different. History tells us that.

So on this day, the one hundred fifty-ninth anniversary of the Constitution of May the 3d of Poland, let us give our Polish friends our most sincere assurance of our moral support to cheer them to encourage them in their continued fight for freedom in full sense of the word. Long live Poland. Let their culture, traditions, and art enrich our new American culture.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, this day marks the one hundred and fifty-ninth anniversary of the adoption of one of the world's most precious documents, the Polish Constitution.

That document lives today, its spirit and meaning as vigorous as on May 3, 1791, when its birth marked a new advance in European concepts of human liberty and dignity.

It lives not alone in the hearts of those tragically subject to the brutal and foreign tyranny of Soviet Russia, but in the hearts of the millions of countrymen of Kosciusko and Pulaski who helped to build this country in the spirit of the common ideals of the Polish and American Constitutions.

Poland has a tragic history. The insistence of its people on real freedom has always offended those of its larger neighbors who have had good reason to fear a Polish example of vigorous independence on their borders. Poland has again and again suffered invasion and bondage, but the Poles have always thrown off the yoke of their oppressors. I venture to predict that they will do so again.

Only last week, Paul Hoffman, the Administrator of the Marshall plan, said there are two nations now under Communist domination which will lead the ultimate breakaway from the Soviet Union. It is significant that the first name he mentioned was that of Poland.

One of our great objects in the year ahead should be to hasten the day when the democratic spirit of the Polish people can thus express itself without bringing the utter destruction of a great people. May 3 will then become a day of rejoicing as well as of remembering.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TAURIELLO] is recognized for 10 minutes.

INQUITOUS OPINIONS OF ITALY AND ITALIANS

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, on March 13 of this year the Federal Communications Commission began hearings in Los Angeles, Calif., against radio stations KMPC, Los Angeles; WGAR, Cleveland; and WJR, Detroit. I am not concerned about the merits or demerits of this case. I am, however, very much concerned about the type of witness used by the Government.

I would like the RECORD to show that the Federal Communications Commission recently concluded their case against KMPC in Los Angeles and the defense will begin its case on May 15.

In these proceedings the star witness for the Federal Communications Commission was one Clete Roberts, a former employee of Station KMPC, who had been discharged by this station and who admitted he had been fired from every other good job he ever had.

Mr. Speaker, my reason for becoming very interested in this case is that this star witness of the Federal Communications Commission, Clete Roberts, did, while on the witness stand during these hearings on March 17, 1950, and while being cross-examined by Mr. Hugh Fulton, chief trial counsel for Mr. Richards, admit that in a letter he had written he had characterized the people of southern Italy, and I quote, as "charming" but not, in his opinion, "worth a tinker's damn." He further admitted the authorship of a statement that the people of southern Italy were "a lazy and indolent people," that "they wanted"—the United States—"to feed them and think for them" and that these Italians would not "even say thank you for the favors they had received from our country."

When Mr. Fulton asked this man Roberts if he intended to include every clergyman, every farmer, every artisan or mechanic, banker, lawyer, or statesman in southern Italy as not being worth a tinker's damn, or whether these expressions were just unfortunate ones which this man Roberts had written in a letter, this same star witness, Roberts, said several times with great positiveness that such statements were true and that he still stood behind them.

Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to visit the southern part of Italy in the fall of 1949 and I also visited the birthplace of my mother and my father who were born about 100 miles from Naples. The people of southern Italy may not possess all the worldly goods we enjoy in this country, and that is admitted—but they are a hard-working, honest, and God-fearing people. Like every Member of this House, I am proud of my ancestry.

During my visit to the southern part of Italy, where my people came from, I made it my business to inquire as to whether they had heard of the Marshall plan or if they had received any benefits from it—either directly or indirectly. Their answer to me was that they had never heard of our Marshall plan. In other words, Mr. Speaker, these southern Italians have been, and are, a race of people who earned what they have by the sweat of their brow. The reason that so many Italian immigrants migrated to the United States was because they were ambitious, hard-working, and wanted to become a part of this land of opportunity. I think that it is an accepted fact that the Italian-Americans in the United States have played a great part in building this great country of ours.

With all the above in mind it is understandable, therefore, why I deeply resent the remarks of such a man as

this individual, Clete Roberts. In what manner, shape, or form can he possibly look upon himself as a 100-percent American? In my judgment he has no understanding at all of what begins to constitute good Americanism. When a witness like this man Roberts places all the Italians of southern Italy in one class as not being worth "a tinker's damn," he forfeits any support whatsoever from any real Americans.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, and with very deliberate and emphatic feeling, I want it understood that it is more than amazing to me that a man of this type, who expresses under oath such opinions as have been placed in this RECORD today, could possibly be advanced and supported by any agency of our Government as a credible witness. I respectfully draw the attention of all Members of the House to my remarks on this one point because I intend to explore this matter a great deal further, so that the Federal Communications Commission will, in the future, take a great deal more care in investigating the credibility and Americanism of a witness whom it has supported, and apparently continues to support, as one of its star performers.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a part of this record a translation of an editorial from the Italian-American paper in Los Angeles, Calif., dated March 24, 1950:

[From L'Italo-Americano, Los Angeles, Calif., of March 24, 1950]

LANTERN

(Full text translated from the Italian of column by Clete Baroni, editor and publisher)

Iniquitous opinions of Italy and of the Italians—ever since I sailed the ocean to come into a land discovered by an Italian and called by the name of another Italian—I have heard and read so many opinions that now I succeed somewhat not only to control my nerves but also to forgive in a Christian manner those, who through their ignorance or through their inborn prejudice, express these opinions.

I am referring to forgiveness not to gain a seat in heaven or to soften the pious women, but because, distance having been abolished by the airplane, today, for each stupid, evil defamer of Italy, there are thousands and thousands of persons who instead exalt Italy for her beauties and for her glory and for the superb qualities of her people. So, I was not impressed when I learned during the course of instruction that the Federal Communications Commission is conducting among us in reference to the radio stations KMPC, WJR, and WGAR, of a letter which has been carried here and there and written years ago by the accusing Clete Roberts, to his exboss Mr. G. A. Richards. This illustrious gentleman, who went to Italy immediately after the surrender, expresses himself of the Italians thusly: "The people of southern Italy, although charming, are not, in my opinion, worth a tinker's damn. They are lazy, indolent, they want us to feed them, think of them, and they won't even say 'thank you' for the favors."

Without any differentiation and not realizing that the Italians have gone from suffering to suffering—moral suffering and unmentionable physical suffering—Roberts so expresses himself of the Italians, from the donkey land down, as though those from Rome and north were not also Italians. Time does not seem to have changed this opinion of his when at the request of At-

torney Hugh Fulton if he wished to modify what he had written word for word he answered: "No, I will stand behind that letter."

We do not care so much that he changes it, I repeat. It isn't what he thinks of us which may lift or lower us in the opinion of the same people of the world.

One item I would like to bring forth is that this gentleman evidently has open prejudices for a race. He is the same who testified against his exboss, accusing that he, his exboss, tried to influence him into the transmission of telegraphic news to the radio in reference to the Jews and certain political groups.

From what pulpit does the preaching come. I will say and you will say.

I have said above that for each defamer, there are thousands and thousands of persons ready to exalt Italy. Here for example is what the famous American reporter, Maren Schwarzschild, writes of Italy after a tour from one end to the other: "At the end of my Italian experience, I can only tell you this: I adore Italy and her people rich of so many natural talents, and I suggest to whosoever has not visited her to do the impossible to have it become a reality the dream of knowing her as soon as possible. Every minute of stay in Italy will be a discovery and a joy."

I also want to make a part of this RECORD the exact language this witness Roberts used in a letter he wrote to his former employer, in which he attacks the people of southern Italy:

MY DEAR MR. RICHARDS: Periodically, it seems, I feel inclined to drop you a short note and let you know what's happened to me and what I've witnessed in my wanderings abroad.

I've been in Italy and central Europe as well as the Middle East for the past 6 months. I've been pretty fortunate in my assignments, having seen the surrender in northern Italy and the break-up in Germany proper. I've had some contacts with our "ally" the Russians, and I've been thinking quite a bit about this unholy mess over here. And, believe me, Dick, it is a mess. Most discouraging it is, to witness the end-product of all our labors, all our fighting. To me, the muddled picture here is most discouraging. I, personally, have come to feel rather keenly about this war and what it has cost in terms of human life and human suffering. I am inclined to believe that for all we, and by "we" I mean America, have given, we should have some guarantee of peace in return. But, I'm damned if I can see any guaranty of anything but further uncertainty over here for many years to come.

There is, I believe, some hope for Italy providing the industrialists of the north can get the wheels turning in their factories again. There is a heavy Communist flavor all through northern Italy. The partisans are, as you know, dominated by the Communist party. They often display the hammer and sickle red flag alongside the Italian flag. However, I believe some intelligent handling of the economic situation in northern Italy would soon make them forget about Russia, Communism, and everything that goes with it. All the people of Italy want, like people everywhere in this world, is a job, a home and food on the table. Incidentally, I was really impressed by the northern Italians. They are hard working, industrious, intelligent. Their industry, by the way, is not too badly smashed. Our bombing during the strategic phase of the air battle was excellent. We smashed only the key plants. We did not level everything in sight. As a result, I think northern Italy has a fairly good chance of getting back on its industrial feet. At least it can be done faster than anyone previously thought possible. The people of southern

Italy, although charming, are not, in my opinion, worth a tinker's damn. They are lazy, indolent, they want us to feed them, think for them. And they won't even say "thank you" for the favors. The fact that Italy's new prime minister, Ferruccio Parri, came from Milan, in the north, is indication enough as to which way the wind is blowing as far as political influence in this country is concerned.

Please give my kindest personal regards to Mrs. Richards and to your charming daughter.

Sincerely,

CLETE ROBERTS.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAURIELLO. I yield.

Mr. DAVENPORT. I wish to join with the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TAURIELLO] for his condemnation of this very un-American and this very intolerant attitude on the part of the man who is being used by an agency of our Government. It happens that in my district there are tens of thousands of people whose ancestors migrated from southern Italy. They are the people who are the brawn and brain that helped build our great democracy. They built the railroads across the country and helped build the buildings, and have distinguished themselves in every walk of life. I join with the gentleman in condemning this very intolerant attitude on the part of this Mr. Roberts.

Mr. TAURIELLO. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

May I interpose at this point that the ancestors, the mothers and fathers of every Member of the House of Representatives who is of Italian extraction migrated to the United States from the southern part of Italy. They all came within a radius of 100 or 150 miles of where my people came from. Certainly that does not detract from the type of people who came from southern Italy.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BURNSIDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. COOLEY (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by Mr. DOUGHTON.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include certain printed matter.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and in the first to include a resolution and in the second certain remarks.

Mr. ADDONIZIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address delivered by Mr. RODINO.

Mr. ENGLE of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. PATTERSON (at the request of Mr. POULSON) was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter from the Chamber of Commerce of Naugatuck, Conn., and a resolution from the Knights of Columbus.

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. COUDERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. REES) was given permission to extend his remarks and include a resolution.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. QUINN (at the request of Mr. DELANEY), for an indefinite period, on account of illness;

To Mr. STIGLER, until May 9, 1950, on account of official business.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 597. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of J. T. Melson against the United States;

H. R. 1024. An act for the relief of Jacob Brown;

H. R. 1026. An act for the relief of the estate of Susie Lee Spencer;

H. R. 2351. An act for the relief of Aileen L. Sherwood;

H. R. 2719. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of I. D. Cosson, a minor;

H. R. 3536. An act for the relief of Mrs. Nora Johnson;

H. R. 4164. An act for the relief of Elmer Pippin and Mrs. Pansy Pippin and the legal guardian of Norman Otis Pippin, a minor;

H. R. 4270. An act for the relief of Stella Avner; and

H. R. 6051. An act for the relief of Maud E. Raymond.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 277. An act to enhance further the security of the United States by preventing disclosures of information concerning the cryptographic systems and the communication intelligence activities of the United States;

S. 621. An act for the relief of Horace J. Fenton;

S. 2590. An act to amend section 3526 of the Revised Statutes relating to coinage of subsidiary silver coins;

S. 2853. An act to authorize the acceptance of foreign decorations for participation in the Berlin airlift;

S. 2874. An act to amend titles 18 and 28, United States Code, with respect to the time of reporting to Congress rules of procedure adopted by the Supreme Court for criminal, civil, and admiralty cases and the time of their taking effect;

S. 3117. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Postmaster General to impose demurrage charges on undelivered collect-on-delivery parcels," approved May 23, 1930, as amended (39 U. S. C. 246c); and

S. 3255. An act to amend section 415 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, to extend the effective date of that section to December 31, 1950, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 597. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine,

and render judgment upon a certain claim of J. T. Melson against the United States;

H. R. 1024. An act for the relief of Jacob Brown;

H. R. 1026. An act for the relief of the estate of Susie Lee Spencer;

H. R. 2351. An act for the relief of Aileen L. Sherwood;

H. R. 2719. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of I. D. Cosson, a minor;

H. R. 3536. An act for the relief of Mrs. Nora Johnson;

H. R. 4164. An act for the relief of Elmer Pippin and Mrs. Nancy Pippin and the legal guardian of Norman Otis Pippin, a minor;

H. R. 4270. An act for the relief of Stella Avner; and

H. R. 6051. An act for the relief of Maud E. Raymond.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 4, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1428. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1950 in the amount of \$3,000,000 for the Department of Commerce (H. Doc. No. 582), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of Committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 7695. A bill to provide a 5-day week for officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the United States Park Police force, and the White House Police force; with amendment (Rept. No. 2001). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE of California: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 8221. A bill to encourage the conservation and development of the mineral resources of the United States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2002). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 7155. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with the States to enable them to provide technical services to private forest landowners, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2003). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRISON: Committee of conference. H. R. 1243. A bill to amend the Hatch Act (Rept. No. 2004). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 469. An act for the relief of

Cathryn A. Glesener; without amendment (Rept. No. 1977). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2229. A bill for the relief of John P. Hayes, postmaster; Peter J. Grant, assistant postmaster; William W. Crist, superintendent of money orders; and John S. Bantham, station examiner, at Albany, N. Y.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1978). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2535. A bill for the relief of Samuel J. D. Marshall; with amendment (Rept. No. 1979). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3007. A bill for the relief of Harry C. Goakes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1980). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3535. A bill for the relief of William A. Cross; without amendment (Rept. No. 1981). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4140. A bill for the relief of the Great American Indemnity Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1982). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4364. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Clarence F. Moore; John Robert Lusk 3d; J. R. Lusk, Sr.; Gertrude Elizabeth Lusk; Mrs. Willie Pruitt; and Mrs. Billie John Bickle; with amendment (Rept. No. 1983). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4803. A bill for the relief of Bernard F. Elmers; without amendment (Rept. No. 1984). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4960. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth H. Whitney; with amendment (Rept. No. 1985). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5252. A bill for the relief of W. M. Tindal; without amendment (Rept. No. 1986). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5799. A bill for the relief of the Acme Finance Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1987). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6416. A bill for the relief of Paul E. Rocke; without amendment (Rept. No. 1988). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6644. A bill for the relief of Edwin F. Rounds; without amendment (Rept. No. 1989). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7991. A bill for the relief of D. C. Hall Motor Transportation; with amendment (Rept. No. 1990). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2225. A bill for the relief of William B. Buol; with amendment (Rept. No. 1991). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2766. A bill for the relief of Maria Geertrude Mulders; without amendment (Rept. No. 1992). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3805. A bill for the relief of Yuk Onn Won; with amendment (Rept. No. 1993). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5221. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Grazia Riccio DiPietro; without amendment (Rept. No. 1994). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5947. A bill for the relief of Alfio Batelli; without amendment (Rept. No. 1995). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6066. A bill for the relief of Cheng Sick Yuen; with amendment (Rept. No. 1996). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7315. A bill for the relief of Daijiro Yoshida; without amendment (Rept. No. 1997). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7564. A bill for the relief of Maria Margareta Ries and Konrad Horst Wilhelm Ries; with amendment (Rept. No. 1998). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Concurrent Resolution 65. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 1999). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 7966. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the trustees of the Presbyterian congregation of Georgetown," approved March 28, 1806; without amendment (Rept. No. 2000). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 8338. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 8339. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 8340. A bill to extend the rights and responsibilities of the Indians of California; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 8341. A bill to provide an appropriation for the reconstruction and repair of roads and other public facilities in the State of North Dakota which were destroyed or damaged by recent floods; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HUBER (by request):

H. R. 8342. A bill to provide automobiles for blind veterans of World War II who are entitled to compensation for the loss, or loss of use, of one or both legs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 8343. A bill to preserve the scenic beauty of the Niagara Falls and River and to authorize the construction of certain public works on that river for power and other purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 8344. A bill to amend section 313 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 8345. A bill to amend the Columbia Basin Project Act with reference to recordable contracts; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 8346. A bill to provide for the repeal of the act of October 16, 1918, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 8347. A bill to amend title IV of the National Housing Act, relating to insurance of accounts in Federal savings and loan associations, so as to increase the maximum insurable account from \$5,000 to \$10,000; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STEED:

H. R. 8348. A bill to amend the act of February 15, 1923, to release certain rights and interests of the United States in and to certain lands conveyed to the city of Chandler, Okla., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 8349. A bill to authorize deductions from the wages of seamen for payment into employee welfare funds; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. R. 8350. A bill to prohibit transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 8351. A bill to strengthen the common defense by providing for continuation and expansion of Western Hemisphere production of abaca by the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 8352. A bill to facilitate the performance of research and development work by and on behalf of the Departments of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. R. 8353. A bill to amend Public Law 152, Eighty-first Congress, approved June 30, 1949; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H. R. 8354. A bill to require the execution of a loyalty affidavit by every officer or employee in or under the executive, legislative, or judicial branch of the Government of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 8355. A bill to amend sections 174, 200, 200a, and 200b of title 21, United States Code; section 2557 (b), title 26, United States Code; and section 2596, title 26, United States Code, to provide minimum and maximum penalties upon conviction of violation of the act of May 26, 1922, as amended; the act of December 17, 1914, as amended; and the act of August 2, 1937, as amended; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 8356. A bill authorizing the Missouri River Basin agricultural program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 8357. A bill to provide for an agricultural program in the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 8358. A bill to prohibit the purchase by the Federal Government of prison-made goods which compete with goods made by free labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARING:

H. R. 8359. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Carolyn W. Cheatham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H. R. 8360. A bill for the relief of Victor Z. Bergere and Greta S. Bergere; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 8361. A bill for the relief of Toshiko Murai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 8362. A bill for the relief of Bernard Croft; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 8363. A bill for the relief of Harry Chilton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 4, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, March 29, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Richard Raines, bishop of the Methodist Church, Indianapolis, Ind., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, without whose knowledge not a sparrow falleth, whose purposes cannot be frustrated, Thou hast committed to us the swift and solemn trust of life and set us amid circumstances so perplexing and uncertain that we know not what a day may bring forth. We do know that the hour for serving Thee is always present. Awaken us to the claims and guidance of Thy holy will. Grant us in all our doubts and uncertainties the good sense to ask what Thou wouldst have us to do, that the spirit of wisdom might save us from all false choice.

Consecrate with Thy presence the way our feet must go, and the humblest work will shine and the rough places be made plain. Lift us above unrighteous anger and vengeance and suspicion into faith and hope and charity by a simple and steadfast reliance on Thy holy will.

We pray in the name of Thy blessed Son. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 3, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILL

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on May 3, 1950, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 930) to provide for the liquidation of the trusts under the transfer agreements with State rural rehabilitation corporations, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 455) authorizing the designation of American Student Nurse Days, 1950, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.